arXiv:0705.3014v1 [math.CA] 21 May 2007

NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR SOLVABILITY OF THE HARTMAN-WINTNER PROBLEM FOR DIFFERENCE EQUATIONS

N.A. CHERNYAVSKAYA
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV
P.O.B. 653, BEER-SHEVA, 84105, ISRAEL

L.A. SHUSTER
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, 52900 RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL

Abstract. The equation

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta y_{n-1}) = (q_n + \sigma_n)y_n, \quad n \ge 0 \tag{1}$$

is viewed as a perturbation of the equation

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta z_{n-1}) = q_n z_n, \quad n \ge 0 \tag{2}$$

which does not oscillate at infinity. The sequences $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $\{q_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are assumed real, $r_n > 0$ for all $n \ge 0$, the sequences $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ may be complex-valued. We study the Hartman-Wintner problem on asymptotic "integration" of (1) for large n in terms of solutions of (2) and the perturbation $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$.

1. Introduction

In the present paper we consider difference equations

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta y_{n-1}) = (q_n + \sigma_n)y_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{1.1}$$

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta z_{n-1}) = q_n z_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{1.2}$$

where the sequences $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $\{q_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are assumed real, $r_n > 0$ for all $n \ge 0$, and the sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ may be complex-valued; $\Delta a_n = a_{n+1} - a_n$, $n \ge 0$, for every sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. We assume that equation (1.2) does not oscillate at infinity. It is known [1, Ch.VI] that in this case it has solutions $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (the principal, or recessive, solution) and $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (the non-principal, or dominant, solution), and there is an integer n_0 such that the following

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 39A11.

relations hold:

$$\begin{gathered} u_n > 0, \quad v_n > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad n \ge n_0 \\ r_n(v_{n+1}u_n - u_{n+1}v_n) = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad n \ge 0 \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{u_n}{v_n} = 0, \quad \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_n u_n u_{n+1}} = \infty, \quad \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n v_{n+1}} < \infty. \end{gathered} \tag{1.3}$$

Our goal is to study the following problem: To find conditions on $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ under which there exists a fundamental system of solutions (FSS) $\{\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of equation (1.1) such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\tilde{u}_n}{u_n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\tilde{v}_n}{v_n} = 1 \tag{1.4}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{u}_{n+1}}{\tilde{u}_n} = \frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{r_n u_n v_n}\right) \quad \text{for} \quad n \to \infty \tag{1.5}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{v}_{n+1}}{\tilde{v}_n} = \frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{r_n u_n v_n}\right) \quad \text{for} \quad n \to \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

Here we assume that a FSS $\{u_n, v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of equation (1.2) with properties (1.3) is known.

A similar question for differential equations was first studied by P. Hartman and A. Wintner, and therefore we relate the above problem to their names (and denote it throughout as problem (1.4)–(1.6)); see [2],[6],[7], [8],[10] for generalities on problems (1.4)–(1.6); see [3] for a summary of results on the Hartman-Wintner problem. Note that a problem close to (1.4)–(1.6) was studied in [11], and the main result of [11] can be interpeted as a solution of problem (1.4)–(1.6). Therefore below we present statements of that paper ("projecting" them on to the Hartman-Wintner problem) and emphasize that the problem considered there is different from problem (1.4)–(1.6). Here and throughout the sequel we say that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable if (1.1) has a FSS $\{\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ satisfying (1.4)–(1.6); in (1.3), without loss of generality, we assume n_0 equal to zero.

Assertion 1.1. *(*[11]*) If the series*

$$J \overset{def}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n v_n \tag{1.7}$$

converges (at least conditionally), then the sequence

$$C_n \overset{def}{=} \frac{v_n}{u_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{1.8}$$

is well defined, and the following inequalities hold:

$$|C_n| \le 2A_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots; \quad A_n \overset{def}{=} \sup_{m\ge n} |J_m|, \quad J_m \overset{def}{=} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k v_k. \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 1.1. *(*[11]*) Suppose that the series J (see* (1.7)*) converges (at least, conditionally), and, in addition,*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{A_{n+1}|C_{n+1}|}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}<\infty \tag{1.10}$$

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\sup_{n\ge m}\frac{1}{A_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{A_{n+1}|C_{n+1}|}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}=\mu<\frac{1}{2}. \tag{1.11}$$

Then the Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable.

Corollary 1.1.1. *If the series J (see* (1.7)*) absolutely converges, then problem* (1.4)–(1.6) *is solvable.*

We prove Assertion 1.1 in §5. Theorem 1.1 is proved in §8. Note that assumption (1.11) in its statement turned out to be superfluous.

Let us now formulate our results. The following theorem contains necessary conditions for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.6).

Theorem 1.2. *If the Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable, then the series σ :*

$$\sigma\overset{def}{=}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sigma_nu_n^2 \tag{1.12}$$

converges (at least conditionally), the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ (see (1.8)*) is well defined, and, in addition,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}C_n=0. \tag{1.13}$$

For the reader's convenience, let us outline the plan of the paper. Below we follow the general approach to the study of problem (1.4)–(1.6) which was proposed in [3] for its differential analogue. This means that we restrict the initial problem in order to obtain a criterion for solvability of the narrow problem (see Definition 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 below), and then find precise a priori requirements to $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ under which the initial problem is equivalent to the narrow one (see Theorem 1.4 below). Finally, we analyze why the conditions for solvability of the Hartman-Wintner problems for differential and difference equations are not completely analogous whereas the statements of these problems are completely analogous (see [3]). We also present examples to all the main results of the paper (see §9). We now go over to precise statements.

Definition 1.1. Problem (1.4)–(1.6) with the additional requirement

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}r_nu_nv_{n+1}\left|\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}-\frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n}\right|^2<\infty \tag{1.*}$$

is called the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem (and is referred to below as problem (1.4)–(1.$*$)).

To give a criterion for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) and its consequences, we need the following series:

$$G \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \qquad \text{(see (1.8))} \tag{1.14}$$

$$L \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Re(J_{n+1}\overline{C}_{n+1})}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \qquad \text{(see (1.9))} \tag{1.15}$$

$$P \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{Re}(\sigma_n \overline{C}_n) u_n v_n. \tag{1.16}$$

Lemma 1.1. *Suppose that the series J (see (1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally). Then the series L converges (at least, conditionally) if and only if the series G converges, and the series P converges (at least, conditionally) if and only if the series G (see (1.14) and B both converge, where*

$$B \overset{def}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\sigma_n u_n v_n|^2. \tag{1.17}$$

The next theorem contains the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.3. *The narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable if and only if the series J converge (at least, conditionally; see (1.7)) and either the series G or L converge (L at least, conditionally).*

Corollary 1.3.1. *The narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable provided the series J (see(1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally) and any of the following conditions I)–IV) holds:*

I) *at least one of the following inequalities holds (see (1.9)):*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|J_{n+1} C_{n+1}|}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{A_{n+1}|C_{n+1}|}{r_n v_{n+1} u_n} < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|J_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} < \infty. \tag{1.18}$$

II) *the series P converges (at least, conditionally);*

III) *the following inequality holds (see (1.9)):*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\sigma_n| A_n u_n v_n < \infty \tag{1.19}$$

IV) *the series J (see (1.7)) absolutely converges.*

Theorem 1.3 contains a criterion for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) (but not of problem (1.4)–(1.6)). Therefore one can pose the problem: to find requirements to the perturbation $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ under which the Hartman-Wintner and its narrow analogue are indistinguishable (equivalent). Clearly, if problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable, then problem (1.4)–(1.6) is also solvable. Therefore the above question can be reduced to the following: to find precise a priori requirements to $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ under which any solution of problem (1.4)–(1.6) (i.e., any FSS $\{\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of equation (1.1) satisfying relations (1.4)–(1.6)) also satisfies condition (1.$*$). In the last case, the Hartman-Wintner problem is completely reduced to the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem, and we say that the two problems are equivalent. A criterion for the equivalence of problem (1.4)–(1.6) and (1.4)–(1.$*$) is given in Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that the Hartman Wintner problem is solvable and* $\{\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *is a FSS of* (1.1) *satisfying* (1.4)–(1.6). *Then inequality* (1.$*$) *holds if and only if* $G < \infty$ *(see* (1.14)*).*

Note that Theorem 1.4 often (but not always, see examples in §9) allows one to reduce the study of problem (1.4)–(1.6) to the study of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$), i.e., to the application of Theorem 1.3. More precisely, the set of equations (1.1) for which such a reduction is impossible is not larger than the set of equations (1.1) for which the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is defined, $C_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, and $G = \infty$ (see (1.14)).

Let us now analyze what is common and what is different in the statement on solvability of the Hartman-Wintner problems for differential and difference equations. For brevity, we shall do that by conditional comparison of results, as follows. We assume that the criteria for solvability of the narrow Hartman-Wintner problems for differential and difference equations are completely analogous. Under this assumption, we obtain the following assertions (we put them in quotation marks because they are false):

“Lemma 1.2”. *Suppose that the series J (see* (1.7)*) converges (at least, conditionally). Then the series L and P (see* (1.15)–(1.16)*) converge (at least, conditionally) if and only if the series G (see* (1.14)*) converges.*

“Theorem 1.5”. *The narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable if and only if condition α) and any of conditions β), γ), or θ) hold:*

- α) *the series J (see* (1.7)*) converges (at least, conditionally);*
- β) *the series G (see* (1.14) *converges;*

γ) *the series* L *(see* (1.15) *converges (at least, conditionally);*

θ) *the series* P *(see* (1.18)*) converges (at least, conditionally).*

Let us now compare "Theorem 1.5" with Theorem 1.3. We see that in the parts α)–β) and α)–γ), "Theorem 1.5" is true (and thus completely analogous to the corresponding theorem for differential equations). Here we see the complete analogy between the narrow Hartman-Wintner problems for differential and difference equations. In the part α)–θ), "Theorem 1.5" is no longer true, and here we see the difference between these problems. According to Corollary 1.3.1, in the part α)–θ) "Theorem 1.5" (difference case) is only a sufficient (but not a necessary) condition for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$)). Thus, "discretization" of the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem shows that "Theorem 1.5" is no more precise in the part α)–θ). The reason can be explained by comparing Lemma 1.1 with "Lemma 1.2". The convergence (at least, conditional) of both the series J and P (see (1.7), (1.16) implies not only the convergence of the series G (which already gives a criterion for solvability of the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem) but also the convergence of the series B (see (1.17)) which is, in general, is not obligatory and can be viewed as some "additional load" on the parameters of the problem.

Example 1.1. Consider the Hartman-Wintner problem for the equations

$$\Delta(n^\alpha \Delta y_n) = \frac{(-1)^n}{(n+1)^\beta}\, y_{n+1}, \quad n \ge 1 \tag{1.20}$$

$$\Delta(n^\alpha \Delta z_n) = 0 \cdot z_{n+1}, \quad n \ge 1 \tag{1.21}$$

for $\alpha \in [0,1)$, $\beta \in \left(1-\alpha, \frac{3}{2}-\alpha\right]$. In this case (see Section 9, Example 9.3), problem (1.4)–(1.$*$)) is solvable but the series B (see (1.17)) diverges and, according to Lemma 1.1, the series P (see (1.16)) also diverges, which contradicts the assertion α)–θ) of "Theorem 1.5".

To conclude our analysis, we now have to find a reason which explains the difference between Lemmas 1.1 and "1.2". In this case such a difference arises because the integral calculus and the finite difference calculus are not always completely analogous. More precisely, in the case of the Hartman-Wintner problem for differential equations the proof of the criterion for solvability of type α)–θ) (see "Theorem 1.5") relies, after all, upon the following obvious statement (see [3]): if $x(t)$ is a continuously differentiable function on $[1,\infty)$ such that $x(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, then the integral

$$\int_1^\infty x'(t)x(t)dt \tag{1.22}$$

converges. The difference analogue of this integral (with step 1) is of the form

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\Delta x_n)x_n, \quad x_n = x(n), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots; \quad x_n \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \tag{1.23}$$

(It is this series that appears in the course of the analysis of the condition $\alpha)$–$\theta)$ of “Theorem 1.5”, see §5).

It is easy to see that the series (1.23) converges if and only if the series

$$D = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\Delta x_n)^2 \tag{1.24}$$

converges. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\Delta x_n)x_n &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(x_{n+1} - x_n)x_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(x_n x_{n+1} - x_n^2) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{x_{n+1}^2 - x_n^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(x_{n+1} - x_n)^2\right] = -\frac{x_1^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\Delta x_n)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{1.25}$$

Thus, should the integral (1.22) and the series (1.23) (with the above-mentioned requirements to $x(t)$) converge (or diverge) together, “Theorem 1.5” would be true in the part $\alpha)$–$\theta)$. But this asmumption is wrong: for $x(t) = \frac{\cos \pi t}{\sqrt{t}}$, the integral (1.22) converges and the series (1.24), as one can easily see, diverges. Thus the analogy between conditions for solvability of the Hartman-Wintner problems for differential and difference equations is not complete although the statements of these problems are completely analogous.

2. Preliminaries

To prove the result from Section 1, we only need some generalities from the theory of non-oscillating difference equations of order 2. See [1] for a comprehensive exposition. For the reader’s convenience, below we present a standard summary of all the needed facts. Recall that equation (1.2) is said to be non-oscillating at infinity if all its solutions do not oscillate, i.e., do not change sign beginning from a certain number. Therefore, for any fixed FSS $\{u_n, v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of equation (1.2) one can assume that the inequalities $u_n > 0,\ v_n > 0$ hold for all $n \geq 0$. Indeed, otherwise we would just have to change numeration in (1.2) and for each solution find the corresponding constant factor $\tau = \pm 1$. The last line of relations in (1.3) completely characterizes the principal $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and non-principal $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ solutions of (1.2). Here the principal solution $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is determined uniquely up to a costant factor. Let

$\{v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be any non-principal solution. Then the equality

$$u_n = v_n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{2.1}$$

determines the principal solution. The following inequalities are immediate consequences of (1.2), and we will use them repeatedly:

$$\frac{u_n}{v_n} > \frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}, \quad 1 > \frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n} \frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}, \quad r_n u_n v_{n+1} > 1, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.1. *The following equalities hold:*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} = \infty, \qquad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n u_{n+1}} = \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, if $v_{n+1} \geq v_n$ *for all* $n \geq 0$, *then*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_n u_n v_n} = \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 2.1. We do not use equalities (2.3)–(2.4) in the proofs. We present them here because they enable one to evaluate the requirements from the statements in Section 1 more precisely.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. For $n \geq 0$ from (2.1) it follows that (see also (1.3))

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{s=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_s u_s v_{s+1}} = \sum_{s=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_s v_s v_{s+1}} \left(\sum_{k=s}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} \right)^{-1} \\ &\geq \sum_{s=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_s v_s v_{s+1}} \left(\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} \right)^{-1} = \left(\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} \right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\sum_{s=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_s v_s v_{s+1}} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since the remainder R_n of the first series in (2.3) does not converge to zero as $n \to \infty$, the series diverges. Together with inequalities (2.2) and the comparison theorem for series, this implies that the second series in (2.3) and the series (2.4) diverge. □

Remark 2.2. Throughout Sections 3–9 below, in the whole proof the letter τ stands for absolute positive constants which are not essential for exposition and may differ even within a single chain of computations.

3. A Problem Equivalent to the Hartman-Wintner Problem

Our study of problem (1.4)–(1.6) relies upon the following assertion.

Lemma 3.1. *Problem* (1.4)–(1.6) *is solvable if and only if the equation*

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}) = \sigma_n u_n^2\beta_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \tag{3.1}$$

has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n = 1, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Necessity. Suppose that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable. Set

$$\beta_n = \frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and show that $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a solution of the problem (3.1)–(3.2). From (1.4) it follows that $\beta_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. From (1.5) it follows that

$$\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}} = \frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n} + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{r_n v_n u_{n+1}}\,\frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n}, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Delta\beta_n = \beta_{n+1} - \beta_n = \frac{\varepsilon_n\beta_n}{r_n v_n u_{n+1}}$$
$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = \lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n\beta_n = \lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n \cdot \lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n = 0.$$

Thus, relations (3.2) are proved. Furthermore, the equalities

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta\tilde u_{n-1}) = (q_n + \sigma_n)\tilde u_n, \quad \Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta u_{n-1}) = q_n u_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

imply equality (3.1):

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_n u_n^2\beta_n &= \sigma_n u_n\tilde u_n = u_n\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta\tilde u_{n-1}) - \tilde u_n\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta u_{n-1})\\ &= r_n(u_n\tilde u_{n+1} - \tilde u_n u_{n+1}) + r_{n-1}(u_n\tilde u_{n-1} - \tilde u_n u_{n-1})\\ &= r_n u_n u_{n+1}(\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n) - r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n(\beta_n - \beta_{n-1}) = \Delta(r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Sufficiency. Suppose that problem (3.1)–(3.2) is solvable, and let $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be its solution. Set

$$\tilde u_n = \beta_n u_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{3.3}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}) &= \Delta\left[r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\left(\frac{\tilde{u}_n}{u_n}-\frac{\tilde{u}_{n-1}}{u_{n-1}}\right)\right] = \Delta\left[r_{n-1}(\tilde{u}_nu_{n-1}-\tilde{u}_{n-1}u_n)\right]\\ &= r_n(\tilde{u}_{n+1}u_n-\tilde{u}_nu_{n+1})-r_{n-1}(\tilde{u}_nu_{n-1}-\tilde{u}_{n-1}u_n)\\ &= u_n[r_n(\tilde{u}_{n+1}-\tilde{u}_n)-r_{n-1}(\tilde{u}_n-\tilde{u}_{n-1})]-\tilde{u}_n[r_n(u_{n+1}-u_n)-r_{n-1}(u_n-u_{n-1})]\\ &= u_n\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta\tilde{u}_{n-1})-\tilde{u}_n\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta u_{n-1}) = u_n\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta\tilde{u}_{n-1})-q_nu_n\tilde{u}_n\\ &= \sigma_nu_n^2\frac{\tilde{u}_n}{u_n} = \sigma_nu_n\tilde{u}_n.\end{aligned}$$

Since $u_n \neq 0$ for $n \geq 0$, the last equality implies

$$\Delta(r_{n-1}\Delta\tilde{u}_{n-1}) = (q_n+\sigma_n)\tilde{u}_n, \quad n = 0,1,2,\dots$$

Here

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\tilde{u}_n}{u_n} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n = 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $|\beta_n| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for $n \geq n_0 \gg 1$. Then (see (3.3)) we have $\tilde{u}_n \neq 0$ for $n \geq n_0$. Set (see (2.1))

$$\tilde{v}_{n+1} = \tilde{u}_{n+1}\sum_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k\tilde{u}_k\tilde{u}_{k+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq n_0. \tag{3.5}$$

By (3.5) we get

$$\frac{\tilde{v}_{n+1}}{\tilde{u}_{n+1}}-\frac{\tilde{v}_n}{\tilde{u}_n} = \frac{1}{r_n\tilde{u}_n\tilde{u}_{n+1}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad r_n(\tilde{v}_{n+1}\tilde{u}_n-\tilde{u}_{n+1}\tilde{v}_n) = 1, \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq n_0. \tag{3.6}$$

From (3.6) we obtain the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{u}_{n+1}(r_{n+1}\Delta\tilde{v}_{n+1})-\tilde{u}_n(r_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n) = \tilde{v}_{n+1}(r_{n+1}\Delta\tilde{u}_{n+1})-\tilde{v}_n(r_n\Delta\tilde{u}_n) \Rightarrow\\ &\tilde{u}_{n+1}\Delta(r_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n)+r_n\Delta\tilde{u}_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n = \tilde{v}_{n+1}\Delta(r_n\Delta\tilde{u}_n)+r_n\Delta\tilde{u}_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n \Rightarrow\\ &\tilde{u}_{n+1}\Delta(r_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n) = \tilde{v}_{n+1}\Delta(r_n\Delta\tilde{u}_n) = \tilde{v}_{n+1}(q_{n+1}+\sigma_{n+1})\tilde{u}_{n+1} \Rightarrow\\ &\Delta(r_n\Delta\tilde{v}_n) = (q_{n+1}+\sigma_{n+1})\tilde{v}_{n+1}, \quad n \geq n_0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{\tilde{u}_n,\tilde{v}_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ is a FSS of equation (1.1). The following obvious equality is a consequence of (1.3) (see [1]):

$$v_{n+1} = \tau u_{n+1}+u_{n+1}\sum_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_ku_ku_{k+1}}, \quad n \geq n_0. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, from (1.3) we get

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}} = \frac{v_n}{u_n}+\frac{1}{r_nu_nu_{n+1}}\\ \frac{v_n}{u_n} = \frac{v_{n-1}}{u_{n-1}}+\frac{1}{r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n}\\ \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\\ \frac{v_{n_0+1}}{u_{n_0+1}} = \frac{v_{n_0}}{u_{n_0}}+\frac{1}{r_{n_0}u_{n_0}u_{n_0+1}}\end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow \frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}} = \frac{v_{n_0}}{u_{n_0}}+\sum_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_ku_ku_{k+1}} \Rightarrow (3.7)$$

In the following relations, we use (3.5), (3.7), (3.4) and Stolz's theorem (see [4, vol. I]):

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\tilde v_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}\sum\limits_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k\tilde u_k\tilde u_{k+1}}}{\tau u_{n+1}+u_{n+1}\sum\limits_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}}}\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\cdot\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sum\limits_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k\tilde u_k\tilde u_{k+1}}}{\tau+\sum\limits_{k=n_0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}}} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{u_n u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n\tilde u_{n+1}} = 1.\end{aligned}\tag{3.8}$$

Let us now check equality (1.5):

$$\begin{aligned} r_n u_n v_n\left[\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\right] &= r_n u_n v_n\frac{u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}\left[\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}-\frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n}\right]\\ &= (r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n)\frac{1}{\beta_n}\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove equality (1.6). Below we use (3.6), (1.3), (1.5), (3.4), and (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\tilde v_{n+1}}{\tilde v_n} &= \frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}+\frac{1}{r_n\tilde u_n\tilde v_n} = \frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}+\frac{v_{n+1}u_n-u_{n+1}v_n}{\tilde u_n\tilde v_n}\\ &= \frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}+\frac{u_n v_n}{\tilde u_n\tilde v_n}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\right] = \frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}+\left[\frac{u_n v_n}{\tilde u_n\tilde v_n}-1\right]\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\right]\\ &\quad+\frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n} = \frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}+\left[\frac{u_n v_n}{\tilde u_n\tilde v_n}-1\right]\frac{1}{r_n u_n v_n}+\left[\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\right] = \frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}+\frac{\delta_n}{r_n u_n v_n},\\ \delta_n &= \left[\frac{u_n v_n}{\tilde u_n\tilde v_n}-1\right]+\varepsilon_n, \quad \delta_n\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is the sequence defined by equality (1.5):

$$\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{\tilde u_n}=\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}+\frac{\varepsilon_n}{r_n u_n v_n}, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n=0.$$

□

Corollary 3.1.1. *Problem* (3.1)–(3.2) *is solvable if and only if the equation*

$$r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1} = -\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\sigma_k u_k^2\beta_k, \quad n=1,2,\dots\tag{3.9}$$

has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n=1, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = 0.\tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, the solutions of the problems (3.1)–(3.2) *and* (3.9)–(3.10) *coincide if they exist.*

Proof of Corollary 3.1.1. *Necessity.* Suppose that problem (3.1)–(3.2) is solvable, let $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be its solution, and let $m\ge 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=n}^{n+m}\Delta(r_{k-1}u_{k-1}u_k\Delta\beta_{k-1}) &= r_{n+m}u_{n+m}u_{n+m+1}\Delta\beta_{n+m}-r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}\\ &=\sum_{k=n}^{n+m}\sigma_k u_k^2\beta_k. \end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

From (3.2) and (1.3) it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} r_nu_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n=\lim_{n\to\infty}(r_nv_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n)\cdot\frac{u_n}{v_n}=0.\tag{3.12}$$

Therefore, as $m\to\infty$, (3.11) implies (3.9), and (3.2) coincides with (3.10).

Proof of Corollary 3.1.1. *Sufficiency.* Suppose that problem (3.9)–(3.10) is solvable, and let $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be its solution. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}) &= r_nu_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n-r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n\Delta\beta_{n-1}\\ &=-\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\sigma_ku_k^2\beta_k+\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\sigma_ku_k^2\beta_k=\sigma_nu_n^2\beta_n.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.10) coincides with (3.2). □

4. PROOF OF NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR SOLVABILITY OF THE HARTMAN-WINTNER PROBLEM

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable, then by Lemma 3.1 there exists a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of problem (3.1)–(3.2). Note that from (1.3) and (3.2) it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} r_nu_nv_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n=\lim_{n\to\infty}(1+r_nv_nu_{n+1})\Delta\beta_n=\lim_{n\to\infty}\Delta\beta_n+\lim_{n\to\infty}r_nv_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n=0.\tag{4.1}$$

Let $|\beta_n|\ge\frac12$ for $n\ge n_0$ and $m_2\ge m_1\ge n_0+1$. Denote

$$\alpha_n=r_nu_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n,\quad \tau=\frac{u_0}{v_0}+1.$$

Then from (3.1) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}Z(m_1,m_2)\overset{\text{def}}{=}\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\sigma_nu_n^2&=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\Delta\alpha_{n-1}}{\beta_n}=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left[\frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n}-\frac{\alpha_{n-1}}{\beta_{n-1}}+\frac{\alpha_{n-1}\Delta\beta_{n-1}}{\beta_{n-1}\beta_n}\right]\\ &=\frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n}\bigg|_{m_1-1}^{m_2}+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n(\Delta\beta_{n-1})^2}{\beta_{n-1}\beta_n}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

Let $\varepsilon\in(0,1]$. From (3.2) and (4.1) we conclude that there is $n_1>n_0$ such that

$$\sup_{n\ge n_1} r_nu_nv_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{16\tau},\quad \sup_{n\ge n_1} r_nv_nu_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{16\tau}. \tag{4.3}$$

Using (4.2), (4.3), (2.2), (2.1), we now estimate $Z(m_1,m_2)$ for $m_2\ge m_1\ge n_1+1$:

$$\begin{aligned}|Z(m_1,m_2)|&\le 4\sup_{n\ge n_1} r_nu_nu_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{r_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_n|\Delta\beta_{n-1}|^2}{|\beta_{n-1}\beta_n|}\\ &=4\sup_{n\ge n_1}\frac{u_n}{v_n}(r_nv_nu_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|)+4\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{(r_{n-1}u_{n-1}v_n|\Delta\beta_{n-1}|)(r_{n-1}v_{n-1}u_n|\Delta\beta_{n-1}|)}{r_{n-1}v_{n-1}v_n}\\ &\le 4\frac{u_0}{v_0}\,\frac{\varepsilon}{16\tau}+4\frac{\varepsilon^2}{256\tau^2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_{n-1}v_{n-1}v_n}\le\frac{\varepsilon}{4}+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{64\tau^2}\,\frac{u_0}{v_0}<\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This estimate implie that the series σ (see (1.12)) converges in view of Cauchy's criterion. Hence the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ (see (1.8)) is well-defined. It remains to verify (1.13). Denote

$$\begin{aligned}a_n&=\sup_{m\ge n-1}\max\{r_{m-1}u_{m-1}v_m|\Delta\beta_{m-1}|,\quad r_{m-1}v_{m-1}u_m|\Delta\beta_{m-1}|\},\quad n\ge1\\ b_n&=\sup_{m\ge n}\left\{\frac{1}{|\beta_m|},\ \frac{1}{|\beta_m\beta_{m+1}|}\right\},\quad n\ge0.\end{aligned}$$

From (3.2) and (4.1) we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}a_n=0,\quad \lim_{n\to\infty}b_n=1. \tag{4.4}$$

In the following relations we use the above notation and (1.8), (3.12), and (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}|C_n|&=\frac{v_n}{u_n}\left|\sum_{m=n}^{\infty}\frac{\Delta\alpha_{m-1}}{\beta_m}\right|=\frac{v_n}{u_n}\left|\sum_{m=n}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{\alpha_m}{\beta_{m+1}}-\frac{\alpha_{m-1}}{\beta_m}+\frac{\alpha_m\Delta\beta_m}{\beta_m\beta_{m+1}}\right\}\right|\\ &=\frac{v_n}{u_n}\left|\sum_{m=n}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha_m\Delta\beta_m}{\beta_m\beta_{m+1}}-\frac{\alpha_{n-1}}{\beta_n}\right|\le\frac{r_{n-1}u_{n-1}v_n|\Delta\beta_{n-1}|}{\beta_n}\\ &+\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{m=n}^{\infty}\frac{(r_mu_mv_{m+1}|\Delta\beta_m|)(r_mv_mu_{m+1}|\Delta\beta_m|)}{|\beta_m\beta_{m+1}|r_mv_mv_{m+1}}\\ &\le a_nb_n\left\{1+a_n\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{m=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_mv_mv_{m+1}}\right\}=a_nb_n(1+a_n).\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

From (4.5) and (4.4) we get (1.13). □

5. Auxiliary Assertions

In this section we present various technical assertions needed for the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 and their corollaries. Since we use Assertion 1.1, below we present its proof for the sake of completeness.

Proof of Assertion 1.1. Let

$$R_n=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\sigma_k u_k^2,\quad n=0,1,2,\dots \tag{5.1}$$

(In particular, $R_0=\sigma$ (see (1.12)). Below we use notations (1.8)–(1.9), and relations (1.3):

$$\begin{aligned} R_n&=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\sigma_k u_k v_k\ \frac{u_k}{v_k}=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}(J_k-J_{k+1})\frac{u_k}{v_k}\\ &=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\left[J_k\ \frac{u_k}{v_k}-J_{k+1}\ \frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}+J_{k+1}\left(\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}-\frac{u_k}{v_k}\right)\right]\\ &=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\left\{J_k\ \frac{u_k}{v_k}-J_{k+1}\ \frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}-\frac{J_{k+1}}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right\}=J_n\ \frac{u_n}{v_n}-\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{J_{k+1}}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

The series in the right-hand side of (5.2) absolutely converges since by (2.1) we have

$$\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|J_{k+1}|}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\le A_n\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}=A_n\ \frac{u_n}{v_n},\quad n\ge 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Hence the series R_n, $n\ge 0$ converges (at least, conditionally), and therefore by (1.8) the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is well-defined. From (5.2)–(5.3) we get

$$|C_n|=|\frac{v_n}{u_n}\ R_n|=\left|J_n-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{J_{k+1}}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right|\le 2A_n,\quad n\ge 0.$$

□

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that the series J (see (1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally). Then the series*

$$H_n\overset{def}{=}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}},\quad n=0,1,2,\dots \tag{5.4}$$

also converges (at least, conditionally), and the following equality holds:

$$H_n=\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{J_{k+1}}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}},\quad n=0,1,2,\dots \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. According to (1.8), we get (see (5.1) and (1.3)):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C_n=C_{n+1}-C_n&=\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\ R_{n+1}-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\ R_n=\left(\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)R_{n+1}+\frac{v_n}{u_n}(R_{n+1}-R_n)\\ &=\frac{1}{r_n u_n u_{n+1}}\ R_{n+1}-\sigma_n u_n v_n=\frac{C_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}-\sigma_n u_n v_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since the series J converges, (1.9) implies

$$-C_n=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\Delta C_k=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}-J_n\quad\Rightarrow\quad J_n-C_n=H_n. \tag{5.6}$$

On the other hand, from (5.2) and (1.8), we get

$$J_n - C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{J_{k+1}}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}. \tag{5.7}$$

Thus the series H_n, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ converges because of (5.6); and (5.5) follows from (5.6) and (5.7). □

Proof of Lemma 1.1. Since the series J (see (1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally) by Assertion 1.1, the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is well-defined (see (1.8)). Denote

$$\mu_n = \operatorname{Re} C_n, \quad \eta_n = \operatorname{Im} C_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

$$\begin{aligned} L(m_1, m_2) &= \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\operatorname{Re}(J_{n+1}\overline{C}_{n+1})}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}, \quad G(m_1, m_2) = \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \\ \tilde{L}(m_1, m_2) &= \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\mu_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad m_2 \ge m_1 \ge 0 \\ \hat{L}(m_1, m_2) &= \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\eta_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\eta_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad m_2 \ge m_1 \ge 0 \\ \alpha_n &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{\mu_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad \gamma_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{\eta_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

By Lemma 5.1, the sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\gamma_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and the values $\tilde{L}(m_1, m_2)$, $\hat{L}(m_1, m_2)$ are well-defined. Moreover, by (5.6) and (1.13) we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n = \lim_{n\to\infty}\gamma_n = 0. \tag{5.9}$$

Let us now begin the proof. From (5.6) and (5.4), it follows that

$$J_{n+1} = C_{n+1} + H_{n+1} = C_{n+1} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \tag{5.10}$$

In turn, from (5.10) we get for $n \ge 0$:

$$\frac{\operatorname{Re}(J_{n+1}\overline{C}_{n+1})}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} = \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} + \frac{1}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\operatorname{Re}(\overline{C}_{n+1}C_{k+1})}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}. \tag{5.11}$$

The last equality implies for $m_2 \ge m_1 \ge 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} L(m_1, m_2) &= G(m_1, m_2) + \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{1}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\operatorname{Re}(\overline{C}_{n+1}C_{k+1})}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}} \\ &= G(m_1, m_2) + \tilde{L}(m_1, m_2) + \hat{L}(m_1, m_2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

The expression $\tilde L(m_1,m_2)$ can be written in another way (see (1.25)):

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde L(m_1,m_2)&=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}(\alpha_n-\alpha_{n+1})\alpha_{n+1}=-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}[\alpha_{n+1}^2-\alpha_n^2+(\alpha_{n+1}-\alpha_n)^2]\\&=\frac{\alpha_{m_1}^2-\alpha_{m_2+1}^2}{2}-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\mu_{n+1}^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

Similarly, we get

$$\hat L(m_1,m_2)=\frac{\gamma_{m_1}^2-\gamma_{m_2+1}^2}{2}-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\eta_{n+1}^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}.\tag{5.14}$$

From (5.13), (5.14), (5.12) and (5.4), we get

$$L(m_1,m_2)=G(m_1,m_2)+\frac{|H_{m_1}|^2-|H_{m_2+1}|^2}{2}-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}.\tag{5.15}$$

Denote

$$\varkappa(m_1,m_2)=\frac{|H_{m_1}|^2-|H_{m_2+1}|^2}{2}.$$

From (5.6) and (1.13) it follows that

$$\lim_{m_1\to\infty}\varkappa(m_1,m_2)=0.\tag{5.16}$$

From (5.15) and (2.2) it now follows that

$$|L(m_1,m_2))|\ge\left|G(m_1,m_2)-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}\right|-|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|\ge\frac12G(m_1,m_2)-|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|.$$

Hence by (2.2) and the last inequality, we have

$$G(m_1,m_2)\le2|L(m_1,m_2)|+2|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|\tag{5.17}$$

$$|L(m_1,m_2)|\le\frac32G(m_1,m_2)+|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|.\tag{5.18}$$

From (5.17)–(5.18), we conclude that the series G and L satisfy (or do not satisfy) together Cauchy's convergence criterion, which was to be proved.

Let us now prove the second statement of the lemma concerning the series P (see (1.18)). Denote

$$\operatorname{Re}\sigma_n=\mu_n,\quad\operatorname{Im}\sigma_n=\eta_n,\quad n\ge0;$$

$$\alpha_n=\sum_{k=n}^\infty\mu_ku_k^2,\quad\gamma_n=\sum_{k=n}^\infty\eta_ku_k^2,\quad n\ge0;$$

$$P(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\operatorname{Re}(\sigma_n\overline{C}_n)u_nv_n,\quad m_2\ge m_1\ge0;$$

$$\tilde P(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2\left[\mu_nu_n^2\sum_{k=n}^\infty\mu_ku_k^2\right],\quad m_2\ge m_1\ge0;\tag{5.19}$$

$$\hat{P}(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2\left[\eta_n u_n^2\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\eta_k u_k^2\right],\quad m_2\ge m_1\ge 0;$$

$$\varkappa(m,m_2)=|C_{m_1}|^2-|C_{m_2}|^2,\quad B(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}(|\sigma_n|u_nv_n)^2,\quad m_2\ge m_1\ge 0.$$

According to Assertion 1.1, all values in (5.19) are well-defined. From (1.8) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Re}(\sigma_nu_nv_n\overline{C}_n)&=\operatorname{Re}\left(\sigma_nu_nv_n\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\overline{\sigma}_ku_k^2\right)=\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2\operatorname{Re}\left(\sigma_nu_n^2\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\overline{\sigma}_ku_k^2\right)\\&=\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2\left[\mu_nu_n^2\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\mu_ku_k^2+\eta_nu_n^2\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\eta_ku_k^2\right].\end{aligned}\tag{5.20}$$

From (5.20) it immediately follows that

$$P(m_1,m_2)=\tilde{P}(m_1,m_2)+\hat{P}(m_1,m_2).\tag{5.21}$$

Note that

$$\alpha_n=\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{u_n}{v_n}C_n\right),\quad \gamma_n=\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{u_n}{v_n}C_n\right),\quad n\ge 0,\tag{5.22}$$

and the values $\tilde{P}(m_1,m_2)$, $\hat{P}(m_1,m_2)$ can be writtenin a form different than (5.19). For example (see (1.25)):

$$\begin{aligned}2\tilde{P}(m_1,m_2)&=2\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2[\alpha_n(\alpha_n-\alpha_{n+1})]=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left(\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)^2[\alpha_n^2-\alpha_{n+1}^2+(\alpha_n-\alpha_{n+1})^2]\\&=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\left[\left(\frac{v_n\alpha_n}{u_n}\right)^2-\left(\frac{v_{n+1}\alpha_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\right)^2+\alpha_{n+1}^2\left(\frac{v_{n+1}^2}{u_{n+1}^2}-\frac{v_n^2}{u_n^2}\right)+(\mu_nu_nv_n)^2\right]\\&=(\operatorname{Re}C_{m_1})^2-(\operatorname{Re}C_{m_2+1})^2+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{\alpha_{n+1}^2}{r_nu_nu_{n+1}}\left(\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}+\frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}(\mu_nu_nv_n)^2\\&=(\operatorname{Re}C_{m_1})^2-(\operatorname{Re}C_{m_2+1})^2+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{(\operatorname{Re}C_{n+1})^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}\left(1+\frac{v_nu_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}u_n}\right)+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}(\mu_nu_nv_n)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get

$$2\hat{P}(m_1,m_2)=(\operatorname{Im}C_{m_1})^2-(\operatorname{Im}C_{m_2+1})^2+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{(\operatorname{Im}C_{n+1})^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}\left(1+\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}\right)+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}(\eta_nu_nv_n)^2.$$

Hence

$$2P(m_1,m_2)=\varkappa(m_1,m_2)+\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}\left(1+\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}\,\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\right)+B(m_1,m_2).$$

The last equality and (2.2) imply

$$|P(m_1,m_2)|\le|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|+G(m_1,m_2)+B(m_1,m_2);\tag{5.23}$$

$$2|P(m_1,m_2)|+|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)|\ge G(m_1,m_2)+B(m_1,m_2).\tag{5.24}$$

Since

$$\lim_{m_1\to\infty} \varkappa(m_1,m_2)=0, \tag{5.25}$$

the assertion of the lemma now follows from (5.23), (5.24), (5.25) and Cauchy's convergence criterion. □

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that the series* J *(see* (1.7)*) converges (at least, conditionally). Then the series* G *(see* (1.14)*) converges if the series*

$$I=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{|J_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}} \tag{5.26}$$

converges.

Proof. We use equality (5.6) (see also (5.4)):

$$J_{n+1}=C_{n+1}+\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}=C_{n+1}+H_{n+1}. \tag{5.27}$$

From (5.27) we get (using notations (5.8)):

$$(\operatorname{Re}J_{n+1})^2=(\operatorname{Re}C_{n+1})^2+2\mu_{n+1}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu_{k+1}}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}+(\operatorname{Re}H_{n+1})^2; \tag{5.28}$$

$$(\operatorname{Im}J_{n+1})^2=(\operatorname{Im}C_{n+1})^2+2\eta_{n+1}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{\eta_{k+1}}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}+(\operatorname{Im}H_{n+1})^2. \tag{5.29}$$

Let $m_2\ge m_1\ge 0$. Set

$$I(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|J_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}},\qquad H(m_1,m_2)=\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|H_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}$$

From (5.28)–(5.29) it immediately follows that

$$I(m_1,m_2)=G(m_1,m_2)+H(m_1,m_2)+\hat{L}(m_1,m_2)+\tilde{L}(m_1,m_2)$$

(see (5.8)). From the last inequality by (5.13), (5.14), (5.15), and (5.16), we get

$$I(m_1,m_2)=G(m_1,m_2)-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}+H(m_1,m_2)+\varkappa(m_1,m_2). \tag{5.30}$$

From (5.30), by (2.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(m_1,m_2)+|\varkappa(m_1,m_2)| &\ge \left|G(m_1,m_2)-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}+H(m_1,m_2)\right|\\ &=G(m_1,m_2)-\frac12\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{(r_nu_nv_{n+1})^2}+H(m_1,m_2)\ge\frac12G(m_1,m_2)+H(m_1,m_2)\\ &\ge\frac12G(m_1,m_2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

From (5.16), (5.31) and Cauchy's convergence criterion we now conclude that if the series I converges (see (5.26)), then the series G also converges. □

6. Proof of the Criterion for Equivalence of the Hartman-Wintner Problem to its Restriction

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Necessity.

We need the following obvious assertions.

Lemma 6.1. *Problem* (1.1)–(1.$*$) *is solvable if and only if problem* (3.9)–(3.10) *has a solution* $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n u_n v_{n+1} |\Delta\beta_n|^2 < \infty. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Necessity. Suppose that problem (1.1)–(1.$*$) is solvable. Then, clearly, problem (1.4)–(1.6) is also solvable, and the two problems have a common solution, a FSS of equation (1.1). Then by Lemma 3.1 and its Corollary 3.1.1, equation (3.9) has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with properties (3.10), and $\tilde u_n = \beta_n u_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ (see (3.3)). Therefore (1.$*$) implies

$$\infty > \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n u_n v_{n+1} \left|\frac{\tilde u_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}} - \frac{\tilde u_n}{u_n}\right|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n u_n v_{n+1} |\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n u_n v_{n+1} |\Delta\beta_n|^2.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Sufficiency. Suppose that problem (3.9)–(3.10) has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with property (6.1). Then by Lemma 3.1 and its Corollary 3.1.1, problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable, and $\tilde u_n = \beta_n u_n$, $n \ge 0$. Then the series (6.1) is none other than the series (1.$*$). □

Lemma 6.2. *The Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable if and only if the series σ (see* (1.12)*) converges (at least, conditionally), and the equation*

$$r_n u_n u_{n+1} \Delta\beta_n = -\beta_{n+1} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2 - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \Delta\beta_k \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} \sigma_m u_m^2 \tag{6.2}$$

has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \beta_n = 1, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} r_n v_n u_{n+1} \Delta\beta_n = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Moreover, the solutions of problem (3.1)–(3.2) *and* (6.2)–(6.3) *coincide if they exist. In addition, the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable if and only if the series σ converges (at least, conditionally) and there exists a solution of problem* (6.2)–(6.3) *with property* (6.1)

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Necessity. Suppose that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable. Then by Theorem 1.2 the series σ converges (at least, conditionally), and by Lemma 3.1 and its Corollary 3.1.1 there exists a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of problem (3.9)–(3.10). Denote

$$\alpha_n=\sum_{k=n}^\infty\sigma_k u_k^2,\quad n=0,1,2,\dots$$

By Theorem 1.2 the sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is well-defined. Let us transform (3.9):

$$\begin{aligned}
r_nu_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n&=-\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\sigma_ku_k^2\beta_k=-\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty(\alpha_k-\alpha_{k+1})\beta_k\\
&=-\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty[\beta_k\alpha_k-\beta_{k+1}\alpha_{k+1}+\alpha_{k+1}\Delta\beta_k]=-\beta_{n+1}\alpha_{n+1}-\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty(\Delta\beta_k)\alpha_{k+1}\\
&=-\beta_{n+1}\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\sigma_ku_k^2-\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\Delta\beta_k\left(\sum_{m=k+1}^\infty\sigma_mu_m^2\right). \qquad (6.4)
\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the assertions of the lemma either hold automatically, or follow from Lemma 6.1.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Sufficiency.

Since the series σ converges and there exists a solutions $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of problem (6.2)–(6.3), we have well-defined values

$$r_nu_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n,\qquad \beta_{n+1}\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\sigma_ku_k^2,\quad n=0,1,2,\dots$$

Then by (6.2) we conclude that the series

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\Delta\beta_k\sum_{m=k+1}^\infty\sigma_mu_m^2$$

converges, and therefore the chain of computations in (6.4) can be reversed. Equality (3.9) is thus proved. Thus there exists a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of problem (3.9)–(3.10), and it coincides with the solution of problem (6.2)–(6.3). It remains to consider Lemma 3.1, Corollary 3.1.1 and Lemma 6.1. □

Let us now return to Theorem 1.4. Suppose that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable. Then by Theorem 1.2 the series σ converges. Since the inequality (1.$*$) also holds, problem (6.2)–(6.3) is also solvable and its solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfies inequality (6.1) (see Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2). Let us rewrite equality (6.2) in terms of $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (see (1.8)). We get

$$r_nu_nv_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n=-C_{n+1}\beta_{n+1}-\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\Delta\beta_k\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}C_{k+1},\quad n\ge 0. \qquad (6.5)$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} &S_n=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} r_k u_k v_{k+1}|\Delta\beta_k|^2; \quad F_n=\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}|\Delta\beta_k|\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}|C_{k+1}|, \quad n\ge 0\\ &G_m^{(\theta)}=\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}},\ m\ge 0,\ \theta\ge 0; \quad \xi_n=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n\ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Note that the following equality holds:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{v_n}{u_n}\xi_n=0. \tag{6.7}$$

Indeed, from (2.1) and (2.2) it follows that

$$0\le \xi_n=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\ \frac{v_k}{u_k}\ \frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\le \frac{u_n}{v_n}\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|^2. \tag{6.8}$$

From (6.8) and (1.13) we obtain (6.7).

Let us now consider (6.5). Let $|\beta_n|\ge \frac{1}{2}$ for $n\ge n_0$. For such n from (6.5) it follows that

$$\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{8}\le\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2|\beta_{n+1}|^2}{2}\le (r_n u_n v_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|)^2+\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}|\Delta\beta_k|\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}|C_{k+1}|\right]^2. \tag{6.9}$$

Let $m\ge n_0$, $\theta\in N$. From (6.9) we get

$$\frac{1}{8}G_m^{(\theta)}\le S_m-S_{m+\theta+1}+\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{F_n^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\le S_m+\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{F_n^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}. \tag{6.10}$$

Let us estimate the second sum in (6.10). First note that from the definition of F_n, S_n and Schwarz's inequality, we obtain

$$F_n\le\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}S_{n+1}^{1/2}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\right)^2\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2}. \tag{6.11}$$

In the following relations, we use (6.11), (2.2), (1.3) and (6.8):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{F_n^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} &\le \sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{S_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\left(\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\right)^2\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\right)^2\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}\\ &\le S_m\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{1}{r_n u_n u_{n+1}}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\right)^2\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}\right]\\ &\le S_m\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{1}{r_n u_n u_{n+1}}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\ \frac{u_{n+2}}{v_{n+2}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\ \frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}\right]\\ &\le S_m\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}-\frac{v_n}{v_n}\right]\xi_{n+1}=S_m\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}\xi_{n+1}-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\xi_n+\frac{v_n}{u_n}(\xi_n-\xi_{n+1})\right]\\ &=S_m\left[\frac{v_k}{u_k}\xi_k\Big|_m^{m+\theta+1}+\sum_{n=m}^{m+\theta}\frac{v_n}{u_n}\ \frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}\ \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}\right]\le S_m\sup_{k\ge m+\theta}|C_k|^2+S_m G_m^{(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Let us choose a bigger n_0 (if necessary) so that $S_m \le 16^{-1}$ for $m \ge n_0$. Then (6.12) and (6.10) imply

$$G_m^{(\theta)} \le 16S_m + 16S_m \sup_{k\ge m+\theta} |C_k|^2, \quad m \ge n_0. \tag{6.13}$$

Let us take the limit in (6.13) (as $\theta \to \infty$). Then by (1.13) we have

$$\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} = \lim_{\theta\to\infty} G_m^{(\theta)} \le 16S_m < \infty.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Sufficiency. Suppose that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable and $G < \infty$ (see (1.14)). Then by Theorem 1.2 the series σ (see (1.2)) converges (at least, conditionally), the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is well-defined, and by Lemma 6.2 there exists a solution of $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of problem (6.2)–(6.3) and it coincides with the solution of problem (3.1)–(3.2). Let us transform (6.5):

$$\mu_n = r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{6.14}$$

We get

$$\mu_n = -\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}} C_{n+1}\beta_{n+1} - \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{C_{k+1}\mu_k}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \tag{6.15}$$

From (6.15), taking into account (3.10), we get for $n \ge 0$

$$|\mu_n| = r_n v_k u_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n| \le \tau\left[\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}|C_{n+1}| + \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]. \tag{6.16}$$

Let us estimate the sum in the right-hand side of (6.16). Below we use Schwarz's inequality and (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} &\le \frac{v_n}{u_n}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sqrt{\frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

From (6.16) and (6.17) it follows that

$$r_n v_n u_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n| \le \tau\left\{\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}|C_{n+1}| + \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sqrt{\frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2}\right\}.$$

Let us multiply the last inequality by $\sqrt{\frac{u_n v_{n+1}}{r_n}}\,\frac{1}{v_n u_{n+1}}$. We get

$$\sqrt{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}|\Delta\beta_n| \le \tau\left\{\frac{|C_{n+1}|}{\sqrt{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_n u_n u_{n+1}}}\left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}\right]^{1/2}\right\}.$$

Hence

$$r_nu_nv_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|^2 \le \tau\left\{\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}} + \frac{1}{r_nu_nu_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}}\right\}. \tag{6.18}$$

Let us sum up the inequalities (6.18) for $n \ge 0$. Then (see (6.6) and (1.14))

$$S \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_nu_nv_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|^2 \le \tau\left\{G + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_nu_nu_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}}\right\}. \tag{6.19}$$

Let us estimate the sum in the right-hand side of (6.19). Denote

$$W_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \tag{6.20}$$

The sequence $\{W_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is well-defined. Indeed, as shown above, the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is defined and it is bounded because of (1.13). Hence, according to (2.1), we have

$$0 \le W_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}} \le \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_{k+1}|^2\right)\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}} = \frac{u_n}{v_n}\sup_{k\ge n}|C_{k+1}|^2. \tag{6.21}$$

From (6.21) and (1.13) we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{v_n}{u_n}W_n = 0. \tag{6.22}$$

In the following relations, we use (1.3), (6.22):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_nu_nu_{n+1}}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}} - \frac{v_n}{u_n}\right)W_{n+1}\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left[\frac{v_{n+1}}{u_{n+1}}W_{n+1} - \frac{v_n}{u_n}W_n - \frac{v_n}{u_n}(W_{n+1}-W_n)\right]\\
&= -\frac{v_0}{u_0}W_0 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{v_n}{u_n}\,\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_nv_nv_{n+1}} = G - \frac{v_0}{u_0}W_0 \le G.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

From (6.18) and (6.23) it follows that

$$S = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_nu_nv_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n|^2 \le \tau G < \infty.$$

□

7. Double Purpose Lemmas

In this section we present some technical assertions which will be applied in the proof of Theorem 1.3, both in the "necessary" and the "sufficient" part. In the statements below we use assumptions of two types – condition A) and condition B):

A) the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem (problem (1.4)–(1.$*$)) is solvable;

B) the series G and J converge (J at least, conditionally) (see (1.4), (1.7)).

Throughout the sequel by condition A) we mean the collection of all criteria already proved for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$). Thus the expression "condition A) holds" means that the following requirements are satisfied:

A.1) the series σ (see (1.12) converges (at least, conditionally) (see Theorem 1.2);

A.2) the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (see (1.8)) is well-defined, and equality (1.13) holds (see Theorem 1.2);

A.3) the inequality $G<\infty$ holds (see (1.14) and Theorem 1.4);

A.4) the series σ converges (at least, conditionally), and problem (6.2)–(6.3) has a solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ which satisfies inequality (6.1) and equality (6.15) (see Lemma 6.2).

Similarly, the expression "condition B) holds" means that the following requirements are satisfies:

B.1) the series J converges (at least, conditionally);

B.2) Condition A.1) holds (see Assertion 1.1);

B.3) Condition A.2) holds and inequalities (1.9) hold (see Assertion 1.1);

B.4) Condition A.3) holds (see Theorem 1.4).

Let us proceed to the exposition of the results.

Let n_0 denote a number and define

$$\theta \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\theta_k\}_{k=n_0}^\infty, \qquad \|\theta\| \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{n\ge n_0}|\theta_k|. \tag{7.1}$$

In the space of sequences (7.1) let us introduce a linear operator $\mathcal{A}$ and a sequence $g(\theta)=\{g_n(\theta)\}_{n=n_0}^\infty$:

$$\mathcal{A}\theta=\{(\mathcal{A}\theta)_n\}_{n=n_0}^\infty, \quad (\mathcal{A}\theta)_n=\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^\infty\frac{C_{k+1}\theta_k}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}}, \quad n\ge n_0; \tag{7.2}$$

$$g(\theta)=\{g_n(\theta)\}_{n=n_0}^\infty, \quad g_n(\theta)=-\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}C_{n+1}\theta_{n+1}, \quad n\ge n_0. \tag{7.3}$$

Here $\{C_n\}_{n=n_0}^\infty$ is the sequence defined in (1.8).

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that either one of the conditions* A) or B) holds. Then:

$$\|g(\theta)\|\le\left(\sup_{n\ge n_0}|C_n|\right)\|\theta\|; \tag{7.4}$$

$$|(\mathcal{A}\theta)_n|\le\left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\left(\sup_{k\ge n+1}|\theta_k|\right)\le\left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\|\theta\|; \tag{7.5}$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|\le\sup_{n\ge n_0}|C_n|. \tag{7.6}$$

Proof. In the following relations we use the hypotheses of the lemma, (2.2) and (2.1):

$$\|g(\theta)\| = \sup_{n\ge n_0} \frac{u_{n+1}v_n}{u_n v_{n+1}}|C_{n+1}|\;|\theta_{n+1}| \le \left(\sup_{n\ge n_0}|C_n|\right)\|\theta\|;$$

$$|(\mathcal{A}\theta)_n| \le \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|\;|\theta_k|}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} \le \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\left(\sup_{k\ge n+1}|\theta_k|\right)\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}$$

$$= \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\left(\sup_{k\ge n+1}|\theta_k|\right)\frac{v_n}{u_n}\;\frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}} \le \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\left(\sup_{k\ge k+1}|\theta_k|\right) \le \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\|\theta\|;$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}\theta\| = \sup_{k\ge n_0}|(\mathcal{A}\theta)_k| \le \sup_{k\ge n_0}\left(\sup_{m\ge k}|C_m|\right)\|\theta\| \le \left(\sup_{k\ge k_0}|C_k|\right)\|\theta\|.$$

□

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose that either one of the conditions* A) or B) holds. Then there is $n_0 \gg 1$ such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and any vector θ with finite norm (7.1), the following equality holds:

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k\mathcal{A}^k g(\theta)\right)_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k(\mathcal{A}^k g(\theta))_n. \tag{7.7}$$

Proof. Let $n \ge n_0$, and let P_n be the functional defined by the equality

$$P_n\theta = \theta_n, \qquad \theta = \{\theta_k\}_{k=n_0}^{\infty}, \qquad \|\theta\| < \infty.$$

Clearly, P_n is linear. Obviously, $\|P_n\| = 1$ since

$$|P_n\theta| = |\theta_n| \le \|\theta\|$$

and, in addition,

$$P_n\theta_0 = 1 = \|\theta_0\|, \quad \theta_0 = \{\theta_k^0\}_{k=n_0}^{\infty}, \quad \theta_k^0 = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k \ne n \\ 1, & \text{if } k = n \end{cases}$$

Let us now verify that if

$$\theta^{(0)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\theta^{(k)}, \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\|\theta^{(k)}\| < \infty,$$

then the following equality holds:

$$P_n\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\theta^{(k)}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}P_n\theta^{(k)}. \tag{7.8}$$

Indeed, let $m \ge 1$. Then

$$|P_n\theta^{(0)} - \sum_{k=1}^{m}P_n\theta^{(k)}| = \left|P_n\left(\theta^{(0)} - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\theta^{(k)}\right)\right| \le \|P_n\|\;\|\theta^{(0)} - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\theta^{(k)}\|$$

$$\le \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty}\|\theta^{(k)}\| \to 0 \quad as \quad m \to \infty; \;\Rightarrow (7.8).$$

Furthermore, from the hypotheses of the lemma it follows that there is $n_0 \gg 1$ such that $|C_n| \le 2^{-1}$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Then $\|\mathcal{A}\| \le 2^{-1}$ (see (7.6)), and from (7.7) and Lemma 7.1 it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|(-1)^k \mathcal{A}^k g(\theta)\| \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{A}\|^k \|g(\theta)\| \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \|\theta\| = \tau\|\theta\| < \infty.$$

It remains to apply (7.8). ☐

Denote (see (7.2)–(7.3)):

$$f_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{r_n v_n u_{n+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k (\mathcal{A}^k g(\theta))_n, \quad n \ge n_0; \tag{7.9}$$

$$\Phi_n(\theta) = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_n(\theta)|, \qquad \varkappa_n(\theta) = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{A}^s g(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} < \infty, \quad n \ge n_0, \tag{7.10}$$

$$\varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta) = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{A}^s g(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}}, \quad s \ge 1,\ n \ge n_0. \tag{7.11}$$

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose that one of the conditions* A) or B) holds. Then there is $n_0 \gg 1$ such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and any sequence θ with finite norm (7.1), the following inequalities hold:

$$\varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta) \le G_n \left(\sup_{k \ge n} |C_k| \right)^{s-1} \|\theta\|, \quad s \ge 1,\ n \ge n_0, \tag{7.12}$$

$$\varkappa_n(\theta) \le 2G_n\|\theta\|, \quad n \ge n_0, \tag{7.13}$$

$$\Phi_n(\theta) \le 2G_n\|\theta\|, \quad n \ge n_0. \tag{7.14}$$

Here

$$G_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \tag{7.15}$$

Proof. We first prove inequality (7.12) for $s = 1$. From the hypothesis of the lemma, we conclude that the sequences $\{G_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, $\{C_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are well-defined. In the following relations, we consecutively use (7.11), (7.2), (7.3), (6.6), (1.3), (6.7) and (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\varkappa_n^{(1)}(\theta) &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{A}g(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} \left| \frac{v_k}{u_k} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{C_{m+1} g_m(\theta)}{r_m v_m v_{m+1}} \right| \\
&\le \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{m+1}|^2}{r_m u_m v_{m+1}} \frac{u_{m+1}}{v_{m+1}} \|\theta\| = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_{k+1}}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}} \|\theta\| \\
&= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{v_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}} - \frac{v_k}{u_k} \right) \xi_{k+1} \|\theta\| = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \left[\frac{v_{k+1}\xi_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}} - \frac{v_k \xi_k}{u_k} + \frac{v_k}{u_k}(\xi_k - \xi_{k+1}) \right] \|\theta\| \\
&= \left[-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\xi_n + \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{v_k}{u_k} \frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}} \frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}} \right] \|\theta\| \le G_n \|\theta\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the case $s \geq 2$. Denote (see (7.2)):

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{A}^{s-1}g(\theta) = h^{(s)}(\theta) = \{h_n^{(s)}(\theta)\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \quad \Rightarrow \quad h_n^{(s)} = (\mathcal{A}^{s-1}g(\theta))_n, \quad n \geq n_0, \quad s \geq 2, \\ \gamma_k^{(s)}(\theta) = \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{m+1}|\ |h_m^{(s)}|(\theta)}{r_m v_m v_{m+1}}, \quad s \geq 2,\ k \geq n_0. \end{gathered} \tag{7.16}$$

Let us verify that for $\|\theta\| < \infty$ we have the equality

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{v_k}{u_k}\gamma_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta) = 0. \tag{7.17}$$

Indeed, by (1.13), (2.1) and (2.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_k}{u_k}\gamma_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta) &\leq \frac{v_k}{u_k}\Big(\sup_{m\geq k+1}|C_m|\Big)\Big(\sup_{m\geq k+1}(|h_m^{(s)})(\theta)|\Big)\sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_m v_m v_{m+1}} \\ &= \frac{u_{k+1}}{v_{k+1}}\ \frac{v_k}{u_k}\Big(\sup_{m\geq k+1}|C_m|\Big)\sup_{m\geq k+1}(|h_m^{(s)}(\theta)|) \leq \Big(\sup_{m\geq k+1}|C_m|\Big)\Big(\sup_{m\geq k+1}|h_m^{(s)}(\theta)|\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

Furthermore, from (7.16), Lemma 7.1, (7.3), (1.13) and (2.2) it follows that

$$\sup_{m\geq k+1}(|h_m^{(s)}(\theta)|) \leq \|h^{(s)}(\theta)\| = \|\mathcal{A}^{s-1}g(\theta)\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}\|^{s-1}\|g(\theta)\| \leq \tau\|\theta\|.$$

The last estimate and (7.18) imply (7.17). In the following relations, we consecutively use (7.11), (7.16), (7.2), (1.3), (7.16), (7.17), and (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta) &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|(\mathcal{A}^s g(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|(\mathcal{A}h^{(s)}(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}}\left|\frac{v_k}{u_k}\sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty}\frac{C_{m+1}h_m^{(s)}(\theta)}{r_m v_m v_{m+1}}\right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}}\sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{m+1}|\ |h_m^{(s)}(\theta)|}{r_m v_m v_{m+1}} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\left(\frac{v_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}} - \frac{v_k}{u_k}\right)\gamma_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta) \\ &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\left[\frac{v_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}}\gamma_{k+2}^{(s)}(\theta) - \frac{v_k}{u_k}\gamma_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta) + \frac{v_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}}(\gamma_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta) - \gamma_{k+2}^{(s)}(\theta))\right] \\ &= -\frac{v_n}{u_n}\gamma_{n+1}^{(s)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{v_{k+1}}{u_{k+1}}\ \frac{|C_{k+2}|\ |h_{k+1}^{(s)}(\theta)|}{r_{k+1}v_{k+1}v_{k+2}} \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{k+1}|\ |h_k^{(s)}(\theta)|}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}} \\ &\leq \Big(\sup_{k\geq n}|C_k|\Big)\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{|(\mathcal{A}^{s-1}g(\theta))_k|}{r_k v_k u_{k+1}} = \Big(\sup_{k\geq n}|C_k|\Big)\varkappa_{n+1}^{(s-1)}(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

We thus get the estimate

$$\varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta) \leq \left(\sup_{k\geq n}|C_k|\right)\varkappa_{n+1}^{(s-1)}(\theta), \quad s \geq 2,\ n \geq n_0. \tag{7.19}$$

To finish the proof of (7.12), we consecutively use inequality (7.19) and the obtained estimate for $\varkappa_n^{(1)}(\theta)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta) &\le \left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)\varkappa_{n+1}^{(s-1)}(\theta)\le\cdots\le\left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)^{s-1}\varkappa_{n+s}^{(1)}(\theta)\\ &\le\left(\sup_{k\ge n}|C_k|\right)^{s-1}G_n\|\theta\|.\end{aligned}$$

From the hypothesis of the lemma, it follows that there is $n_0\gg 1$ such that $\sup\limits_{k\ge n_0}|C_k|\le 2^{-1}$. Then (7.10), (7.11) and (7.12) imply (7.13):

$$\begin{aligned}\varkappa_n(\theta)=\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\varkappa_n^{(s)}(\theta)&\le G_n\cdot\|\theta\|\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\left(\sup_{k\ge n_0}|C_k|\right)^{s-1}\\ &\le G_n\|\theta\|\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^{s-1}}=2G_n\|\theta\|.\end{aligned}$$

Estimate (7.14) follows from (7.13), the well-known theorem on changing summation order for the series with positive terms (see [9, §1.6]) and (7.9):

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_n(\theta)&=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}|f_k(\theta)|=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_kv_ku_{k+1}}\left|\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}(-1)^s(\mathcal{A}^sg(\theta))_k\right|\\ &\le\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_kv_ku_{k+1}}\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}|(\mathcal{A}^sg(\theta))_k|=\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{|(\mathcal{A}^sg(\theta))_k|}{r_kv_ku_{k+1}}=\varkappa_n(\theta)\le 2G_n\|\theta\|.\end{aligned}$$

□

8. Proof of the Criterion for Solvability of the Narrow Hartman-Wintner Problem

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Necessity. Suppose that problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable. This means that condition A) from Section 7 holds, and to prove the necessity of the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 it remains to prove that the series J (see (1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally). Let us prove this. Throughout the sequel $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ denotes a solution of problem (6.2)–(6.3). Recall that by (6.14)–(6.15) and (3.2) we have the following basic equalities:

$$\mu_n=-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}C_{n+1}\beta_{n+1}-\frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}\mu_k}{r_kv_kv_{k+1}},\quad n\ge 0. \tag{8.1}$$

$$\mu_n=r_nv_nu_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n,\quad n=0,\qquad\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_n=0,\quad\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n=1. \tag{8.2}$$

From (7.2)–(7.3) it follows that the system of equalities (8.1) and, more precisely, its part for $n \geq n_0$, can be written in the form

$$\mu = g(\beta) - \mathcal{A}\mu, \qquad \mu = \{\mu_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}, \qquad \beta = \{\beta_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}. \tag{8.3}$$

Let us now choose $n_0 \gg 1$ so that the following inequality holds:

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| \leq \sup_{n \geq n_0} |C_n| \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{8.4}$$

(see (7.6)). Then the operator $\mathcal{A}$ in (8.3) is compressing, and therefore we can find $\mu:$

$$\mu = (E + \mathcal{A})^{-1} g(\beta) = g(\beta) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \mathcal{A}^k g(\beta). \tag{8.5}$$

Here E is the identity operator. By (7.7), equality (8.5) can be written coordinatewise (for $n \geq n_0$) :

$$\mu_n = g_n(\beta) + \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \mathcal{A}^k g(\beta)\right)_n = g_n(\beta) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k (\mathcal{A}^k g(\beta))_n, \quad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.6}$$

From (8.6), (8.1) and (8.2), we get (for $n \geq n_0$):

$$\Delta\beta_n + \frac{C_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \beta_{n+1} = \frac{1}{r_n v_n u_{n+1}} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (-1)^s (\mathcal{A}^s g(\beta))_n. \tag{8.7}$$

Our next goal is to analyze equation (8.7) in detail (note that its solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ exists as a solution of problem (6.2)–(6.3)). For a given $n \geq n_0$, let us introduce a sequence $\{Q_n^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$:

$$Q_n^{(k)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \prod_{s=0}^{k-1} (1 + \eta_{n+s})^{-1}, & \text{if } k \geq 1, \end{cases} \qquad \eta_m \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{C_{m+1}}{r_m u_m v_{m+1}}, \quad m \geq n_0. \tag{8.8}$$

The sequence $\{Q_n^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ can be defined recurrently:

$$Q_n^{(0)} = 1, \quad Q_n^{(k+1)} = \frac{Q_n^{(k)}}{1 + \eta_{n+k}}, \qquad k \geq 0, \ n \geq n_0. \tag{8.9}$$

Note that from (1.13) and (2.2) it follows that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \eta_m = 0. \tag{8.10}$$

Hence n_0 can be chosen so that $|\eta_n| \leq 2^{-1}$ for $n \geq n_0$, and therefore the sequence $\{Q_n^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is well-defined. Let us write the solution $\{\beta_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ of equation (8.7) in the form

$$\beta_{n+k} = d_k Q_n^{(k)}, \qquad n \geq n_0, \ k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{8.11}$$

where the factors d_k, $k \geq n_0$ are to be determined later. From (8.11) it follows that

$$\beta_n = \beta_{n+k} \big|_{k=0} = d_0 Q_n^{(0)} = d_0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_0 = \beta_n. \tag{8.12}$$

To find d_k for $k>0$, let us plug (8.11) into (8.7) with number $(n+k)$, $n\ge n_0$, $k=1,2,\dots$ Here we use the notations (7.9) and (8.8) (see also (8.9)):

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n+k}(\beta) &= \Delta\beta_{n+k}+\frac{C_{n+k+1}}{r_{n+k}u_{n+k}v_{n+k+1}}\beta_{n+k+1}=d_{k+1}Q_n^{(k+1)}-d_kQ_n^{(k)}+\eta_{n+k}d_{k+1}Q_n^{(k+1)}\\ &=Q_n^{(k+1)}(1+\eta_{n+k})d_{k+1}-d_kQ_n^{(k)}=(d_{k+1}-d_k)Q_n^{(k)}\\ &\Rightarrow\begin{cases} d_{k+1}=d_k+\frac{1}{Q_n^{(k)}}f_{n+k}(\beta), & k\ge0,\ n\ge n_0\\ d_0=\beta_n \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

From (8.13) it immediately follows that

$$d_{k+1}=\beta_n+\sum_{\ell=0}^{k}\frac{1}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}f_{n+\ell}(\beta),\qquad k\ge0,\ n\ge n_0. \tag{8.14}$$

Finally, from (8.14) and (8.11) we get

$$\beta_{n+k+1}=d_{k+1}Q_n^{(k+1)}=\beta_nQ_n^{(k+1)}+\sum_{\ell=0}^{k}\frac{Q_n^{(k+1)}}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}f_{n+\ell}(\beta),\qquad k\ge0,\ n\ge n_0. \tag{8.15}$$

Below we study the sequence $\{Q_n^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ in detail for $n\ge n_0$. It turns out that (8.15) admits a more convenient form. To obtain it, we set $k=m-1$, $m\ge1$ in (8.15). Then

$$\beta_{n+m}=\beta_nQ_n^{(m)}+\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1}\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}f_{n+\ell}(\beta),\qquad m\ge1,\ n\ge n_0. \tag{8.16}$$

Let us now check the equality

$$Q_n^{(m)}=Q_n^{(\ell)}\cdot Q_{n+\ell}^{(m-\ell)},\qquad m\ge1,\ \ell=0,1,\dots,m-1;\ n\ge n_0. \tag{8.17}$$

We consider two separate cases:

$$1)\quad \ell=0,\quad m\ge1;\qquad 2)\quad \ell=1,\dots,m-1;\quad m\ge2.$$

1) If $\ell=0$ and $m\ge1$, then (8.8) implies

$$\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}\Big|_{\ell=0}=\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(0)}}=Q_n^{(m)}=Q_{n+\ell}^{(m-\ell)}\Big|_{\ell=0}.$$

2) If $\ell=1,\dots,m-1$; $m\ge2$ then (8.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}&=\frac{(1+\eta_n)\dots(1+\eta_{n+\ell-1})}{(1+\eta_n)\dots(1+\eta_{n+m-1})}=\frac{1}{(1+\eta_{n+\ell})\dots(1+\eta_{n+m-1})}\\ &=\frac{1}{(1+\eta_{n+\ell})\dots(1+\eta_{n+\ell+(m-\ell-1)})}=Q_{n+\ell}^{(m-\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $m\ge1$. Denote

$$M_n^{(m)}=\max_{\ell\in[0,m-1]}\left|\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(\ell)}}-1\right|,\qquad [0,m-1]\overset{\text{def}}{=}\{0,\dots,m-1\}. \tag{8.18}$$

Clearly, there is $\ell_0 \in [0, m-1]$ such that (see (8.17)):

$$M_n^{(m)} = \left| \frac{Q_m^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(\ell_0)}} - 1 \right| = \left| Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)} - 1 \right|. \tag{8.19}$$

Then from (8.19) and (8.16) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{n+m} = \beta_{n+\ell_0+(m-\ell_0)} &= \beta_{n+\ell_0} Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} \frac{Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)}}{Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(\ell)}} f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta) \\ &= \beta_{n+\ell_0} Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} Q_{n+\ell_0+\ell}^{(m-\ell_0-\ell)} f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{n+\ell_0}[Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)} - 1] = \beta_{n+m} - \beta_{n+\ell_0} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} [Q_{n+\ell_0+\ell}^{(m-\ell_0-\ell)} - 1] f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta) \\ - \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta), \quad m \geq 1, \ n \geq n_0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

Let us replace, if necessary, n_0 by a bigger number so that $|\beta_n| \geq 2^{-1}$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Furthermore, note that (8.17) implies

$$\begin{gathered} \max_{\ell \in [0, m-\ell_0-1]} |Q_{n+\ell_0+\ell}^{(m-\ell_0-\ell)} - 1| \leq \max_{\ell \in [0, m-1]} |Q_{n+\ell}^{(m-\ell)} - 1| = \max_{s \in [0, m-1]} \left| \frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(s)}} - 1 \right| = M_n^{(m)}, \\ m \geq 1, \ n \geq n_0. \end{gathered} \tag{8.21}$$

Therefore from (8.20) and (8.21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{(m)} &= |Q_{n+\ell_0}^{(m-\ell_0)} - 1| \leq 2|\beta_{n+m} - \beta_{n+\ell_0}| + 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} |Q_{n+\ell_0+\ell}^{(m-\ell_0-\ell)} - 1| \, |f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta)| \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-\ell_0-1} |f_{n+\ell_0+\ell}(\beta)| \leq 4 \max_{k \in [0,m]} |\beta_{n+k} - \beta_n| + 2 \max_{\ell \in [0, m-\ell_0-1]} \left| Q_{n+\ell_0+\ell}^{(m-\ell_0-1)} - 1 \right| \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} f_k(\beta)| \\ &+ 2 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\beta)| \leq 4 \max_{k \in [0,m]} |\beta_{n+k} - \beta_n| + 2M_n^{(m)} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\beta)| + 2 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\beta)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq n_0$, the following inequality holds:

$$M_n^{(m)} \leq 4 \max_{k \in [0,m]} |\beta_{n+k} - \beta_n| + 2M_n^{(m)} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\beta)| + 2 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\beta)|. \tag{8.22}$$

From Lemma 7.3 we conclude that the estimate (8.22) can be continued as follows (for all $m \geq 1$, $n \geq n_0$) :

$$M_n^{(m)} \leq 4 \max_{k \in [0,m]} |\beta_{n+k} - \beta_n| + 4M_n^{(m)} G_n \|\beta\| + 4G_n \|\beta\|. \tag{8.23}$$

Let ε be a given positive number. From condition A) (see §7) we conclude that there is $n_0(\varepsilon) \ge n_0$ such that for all $n \ge n_0(\varepsilon)$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\max_{k\in[0,m]} |\beta_{n+k} - \beta_n| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{16}, \qquad 4G_n\|\beta\| \le \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right\}. \tag{8.24}$$

Then from (8.23) and (8.24) for all $n \ge n_0(\varepsilon)$, $m \ge 1$, we get

$$M_n^{(m)} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \frac{1}{2}M_n^{(m)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \Rightarrow M_n^{(m)} \le \varepsilon. \tag{8.25}$$

By (8.8), (8.19) and (8.25), we now conclude that

$$\left|\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(0)}} - 1\right| = |Q_n^{(m)} - 1| \le M_n^{(m)} \le \varepsilon \qquad \text{for } n \ge n_0(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 1.$$

Now by (8.8), (8.19) and (8.25), we get

$$|Q_n^{(m)} - 1| = \left|\frac{Q_n^{(m)}}{Q_n^{(0)}} - 1\right| \le M_n^{(n)} \le \varepsilon, \quad n \ge n_0(\varepsilon), \quad m \ge 1,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\left|\prod_{s=0}^{m} \frac{1}{1+\eta_{n+s}} - 1\right| < \varepsilon \qquad \text{for } n \ge n_0(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 0. \tag{8.26}$$

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of (maybe complex) numbers such that $|a_n| \le 2^{-1}$ for all $n \ge 0$. The infinite product*

$$A = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty}(1+a_n)$$

converges to a finite nonzero number if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0(\varepsilon) \gg 1$ such that for all $n \ge n(\varepsilon)$ and all $m \ge 1$, the following inequality holds:

$$\left|\prod_{k=1}^{m}(1+a_{n+k}) - 1\right| \le \varepsilon. \tag{8.27}$$

Proof of Lemma 8.1. Necessity. Suppose that the product A converges to a finite nonzero number. Denote

$$A_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n}(1+a_k), \qquad A_n^{(m)} = \prod_{k=1}^{m}(1+a_{n+k}), \qquad m \ge 1,\ n \ge 0. \tag{8.28}$$

Then the sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges, and by Cauchy's criterion for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $n(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $n \ge n(\varepsilon)$ and $m \ge 1$, the following inequality holds:

$$|A_{n+m} - A_n| \le \varepsilon\frac{|A|}{2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad |A_n|\,|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \varepsilon\frac{|A|}{2}. \tag{8.29}$$

Let us replace, if necessary, $n(\varepsilon)$ by a bigger number so that for all $n \ge n(\varepsilon)$, the following inequality holds:

$$|A_n| \ge \frac{|A|}{2}, \qquad n \ge n(\varepsilon).$$

Then from (8.29) for $n \ge n(\varepsilon)$ and $m \ge 1$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}|A|\,|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le |A_n|\,|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \varepsilon\frac{|A|}{2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad |A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \varepsilon \quad \text{for } n \ge n(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 1.$$

Proof of Lemma 8.1. Sufficiency. Suppose that (8.27) holds. Then there is a sequence of integers $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \frac{1}{2^k} \tag{8.30}$$

for all $n \ge n_k$, $m \ge 1$. Consider the value A_n. Suppose that

$$n_k < n \le n_{k+1}, \qquad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
A_n \quad &= A_{n_1} \cdot A_{n_1}^{(n_2-n_1)} \cdot A_{n_2}^{(n_3-n_2)} \dots A_{n_k}^{(n-n_k)} \quad \Rightarrow \\
|A_{n_1}| &= |A_{n_1}|\,|(A_{n_1}^{(n_2-n_1)} - 1) + 1|\,|(A_{n_2}^{(n_3-n_2)} - 1) + 1| \dots |(A_{n_k}^{(n-n_k)} - 1) + 1| \\
&\le |A_{n_1}|\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)\left(1 + \frac{1}{2^2}\right)\dots\left(1 + \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \le \tau < \infty, \\
|A_n| \quad &= |A_{n_1}|\,|(A_{n_1}^{(n_2-n_1)} - 1) + 1|\,|(A_{n_2}^{(n_3-n_2)} - 1) + 1| \dots |(A_{n_k}^{(n-n_k)} - 1) + 1| \\
&\ge |A_{n_1}|\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^2}\right)\dots\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \ge \frac{1}{\tau} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\tau^{-1} \le |A_n| \le \tau, \qquad n \ge 1. \tag{8.31}$$

Let τ be the number from inequality (8.31). Let now $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and choose $n(\varepsilon)$ so that the following inequalities hold:

$$|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \qquad \text{for} \quad n \ge n(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 1. \tag{8.32}$$

Let us verify that then

$$|A_{n+m} - A_n| \le \varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } n \ge n(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 1. \tag{8.33}$$

We have

$$|A_{n+m} - A_n| = |A_n|\,|A_n^{(m)} - 1| \le \tau\frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} = \varepsilon, \quad n \ge n(\varepsilon),\ m \ge 1.$$

Thus the sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges, and by (8.31) its limit is finite and nonzero, which was to be proved. □

Let us now consider the infinite product

$$P=\prod_{n=n_0}^{\infty}(1+\eta_n),\qquad \eta_n=\frac{C_{n+1}}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}},\qquad n\ge n_0. \tag{8.34}$$

Recall (see (8.10) and below) that $|\eta_n|\le 2^{-1}$ for $n\ge n_0$. Let us show that from condition A) it follows that the product P converges to a finite nonzero number. Suppose (see (8.8)) that $P_n^{(m)}$ is defined by the equality

$$P_n^{(m)}\cdot Q_n^{(m)}=1,\qquad n\ge n_0,\ m\ge 0. \tag{8.35}$$

According to (8.26), for any $\varepsilon>0$ there is $n(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $n\ge n(\varepsilon)$ and $m\ge 0$, the following inequality holds:

$$\left|\frac{1}{P_n^{(m)}}-1\right|<\varepsilon\quad\Rightarrow\quad |P_n^{(m)}-1|<\varepsilon|P_n^{(m)}|. \tag{8.36}$$

Let $\varepsilon=\frac12$. Then there is $n\left(\frac12\right)$ such that for all $n\ge n\left(\frac12\right)$ and $m\ge 0$, we have (in view of (8.36)):

$$\left|\frac{1}{P_n^{(m)}}\right|=\left|\frac{1}{P_n^{(m)}}-1+1\right|\ge 1-\left|\frac{1}{P_n^{(m)}}-1\right|\ge 1-\frac12=\frac12\quad\Rightarrow\quad |P_n^{(m)}|\le 2$$

$$\text{for all}\quad n\ge n\left(\frac12\right),\ m\ge 0.$$

Let now $\varepsilon>0$ be an arbitrary number, and choose $m(\varepsilon)\ge n\left(\frac12\right)\ge n_0$ so that for all $n\ge n(\varepsilon)$ and $m\ge 0$

$$\left|\frac{1}{P_n^{(m)}}-1\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\quad\Rightarrow\quad |P_n^{(m)}-1|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}|P_n^{(m)}|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\cdot 2=\varepsilon. \tag{8.37}$$

From (8.37) and Lemma 8.1, it follows that the product P (see (8.34)) converges to a finite nonzero number. This implies that the series H_{n_0} (see (5.4)) converges (at least, conditionally). To check that note that the series

$$B=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\eta_n^2,\qquad \eta_n=\frac{C_{n+1}}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}},\qquad n\ge 0$$

absolutely converges. Indeed, from (2.2) and condition A) (see Section 7), we get

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty}|\eta_k|^2=\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|C_{k+1}|}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}\right)^2=\sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}\,\frac{|C_{k+1}|^2}{r_ku_kv_{k+1}}\le G<\infty. \tag{8.38}$$

Furthermore, since $\eta_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, there is $n_0\gg 1$ such that for all $n\ge n_0$ we have

$$\ln(1+\eta_n)=\eta_n+O(|\eta_n|^2),\qquad n\ge n_0. \tag{8.39}$$

where the constant in $O(\cdot)$ is absolute. Denote

$$S_n = \prod_{k=n_0}^{n} (1+\eta_k), \qquad B_n = \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} |\eta_k|^2, \qquad n \ge n_0.$$

Then by (8.39) we get

$$\ln S_n = \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \eta_k + O\left(\sum_{k=n_0}^{n} |\eta_k|^2\right) = \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \eta_k + O(B_n), \quad n \ge n_0.$$

Since the sequences $\{\ln S_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$, $\{B_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ in the last equality have finite limits, the series H_{n_0} (see (5.4)) converges (at least, conditionally). This almost immediately implies that the series J (see (1.7)) converges. Indeed, since

$$C_{n+1} - C_n = \frac{C_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} - \sigma_n u_n v_n, \qquad n \ge 0 \tag{8.40}$$

(see the proof of Lemma 5.1), after adding up the equalities (8.40), we obtain

$$C_{m+1} - C_{n_0} = \sum_{n=n_0}^{m} \frac{C_{n+1}}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} - \sum_{n=n_0}^{m} \tau_n u_n v_n, \qquad m \ge n_0.$$

Condition A) (see §7) now implies:

$$-C_{n_0} = \lim_{m\to\infty} (C_{n+1} - C_{n_0}) = H_{n_0} - \lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{n=n_0}^{m} \sigma_n u_n v_n,$$

that is, the series J converges (at least, conditionally), which was to be proved.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Sufficiency. Below we need the following simple auxiliary assertion.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose that condition B) holds (see §7). Then there is $n_0 \gg 1$ such that the infinite product P (see (8.34)) converges to a finite nonzero limit.*

Proof. It is known [9, §1.43, Example (1)], that if the series

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} a_n, \qquad \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 \tag{8.41}$$

converge (the first one at least conditionally), then the infinite product $\prod_{k=n_0}^{\infty} (1+a_n)$, $n_0 \gg 1$ converges to a finite nonzero limit. In our case, $a_n = \eta_n$, $n \ge 0$ (see (8.8)). From condition B) it follows that the second series in (8.41) converges (see (8.38)), and Lemma 8.1 implies that the first series in (8.41) converges. Finally, from the convergence of any series in (8.41) we conclude that $|\eta_n| \le 2^{-1}$ for $n_0 \gg 1$. □

Let us introdue an operator $T^{(n_0)}$ acting in the space of sequences (7.1) by the rule

$$T^{(n_0)}(\theta) = \{(T^{(n_0)}(\theta))_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}, \qquad \|\theta\| < \infty. \tag{8.42}$$

Here

$$(T^{(n_0)}(\theta))_n = -\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{P_n}{P_k} f_k(\theta), \qquad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.43}$$

$$P_n = \prod_{k=n}^{\infty}(1+\eta_k), \quad n \geq n_0, \qquad \eta_k = \frac{C_{k+1}}{r_k u_k v_{k+1}}, \quad k \geq n \tag{8.44}$$

and the values $\{f_k(\theta)\}_{k=n_0}^{\infty}$ are defined by relations (7.9), (7.2) and (7.3). Let us verify that under condition B) there exists $n_0 \gg 1$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, the following inequalities hold (see (7.15)):

$$|(T^{(n_0)}\theta)_n| \leq \tau G_n \|\theta\|. \tag{8.45}$$

Indeed, if $n_0 \gg 1$, by Lemma 8.2 the product P (see (8.34)) converges, and therefore $|P_n| \leq \tau |P_k|$ for all $k \geq n \geq n_0$. Then (7.10) and Lemma 7.3 imply (8.45):

$$|(T^{(n_0)}(\theta)_n| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \left|\frac{P_n}{P_k}\right| |f_k(\theta)| \leq \tau \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |f_k(\theta)| = \tau \Phi_n(\theta) \leq \tau G_n \|\theta\|.$$

From the proven estimate (8.45), we conclude that $\|T^{(n_0)}\| \leq \tau G_{n_0}$. Choosing a bigger n_0, if necessary, we get the estimate $\tau G_{n_0} \leq 2^{-1}$. Then we finally obtain

$$\|T^{(n_0)}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{8.46}$$

Remark 8.1. Recall that according to the proof of Lemma 7.3 the validity of inequality (7.14) is guaranteed by a choice of n_0 such that $\sup\limits_{n \geq n_0} |C_n| \leq 2^{-1}$. Therefore below we assume n_0 chosen big enough so that apart from the above requirements to n_0, the following inequalities hold together:

$$A_{n_0} \leq \frac{1}{4}, \qquad \tau G_{n_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{8.47}$$

(see Assertion 1.1). In (8.47) τ stands for the number from estimate (8.45).

Consider an equation in the space of sequences (7.1) which is essential for that which follows:

$$\beta = P + T^{(n_0)}\beta. \tag{8.48}$$

Here n_0 is chosen so that the estimate (8.46) holds, $P = \{P_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ (see (8.44)). Clearly, the operator $T^{(n_0)}$ is compressing, and therefore equation (8.48) has a unique solution β in the space (7.1), and

$$\|\beta\| \leq \tau \|P\| = \tau < \infty. \tag{8.49}$$

Let us study the properties of the solution $\beta = \{\beta_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ of equation (8.48). From (8.46) and (8.48), we get

$$\beta = (E - T^{(n_0)})^{-1}P = P + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(T^{(n_0)})^k P \tag{8.50}$$

where E is the identity operator. Writing down (8.5) coordinatewise, we get (see Lemma 7.2):

$$\beta_n = P_n + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}[(T^{(n_0)})^k P]_n, \qquad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.51}$$

Let us show that $\beta_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Denote

$$\omega = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(T^{(n_0)})^{k-1}P = (E - T^{(n_0)})^{-1}P \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\omega\| \leq \tau < \infty.$$

Then (8.50) takes the form

$$\beta = P + T^{(n_0)}\omega \quad \Rightarrow \quad \beta_n = P_n + (T^{(n_0)}\omega)_n, \qquad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.52}$$

From (8.45) it follows that

$$|(T^{(n_0)}\omega)_n| \leq \tau G_n\|\omega\| \leq \tau G_n,$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta_n = \lim_{n\to\infty}(P_n + O(G_n)) = \lim_{n\to\infty}P_n = 1.$$

Let us now check that the solution $\beta = \{\beta_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ of equation (8.48) is also a solution of equation (8.7). From (8.48) and the definition of the operator $T^{(n_0)}$, we get

$$\beta_n = P_n - \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{P_n}{P_k}f_k(\beta), \qquad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.53}$$

Let us now define a sequence $\hat{d} = \{\hat{d}_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ by the equality

$$\beta_n = \hat{d}_n \cdot P_n \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{d}_n = 1 - \sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\frac{1}{P_k}f_k(\beta), \qquad n \geq n_0. \tag{8.54}$$

From (8.54) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n &= \hat{d}_{n+1}P_{n+1} - \hat{d}_nP_n = \hat{d}_{n+1}P_{n+1} - \left(d_{n+1} - \frac{f_n(\beta)}{P_n}\right)P_n\\ &= \hat{d}_{n+1}P_{n+1} - \hat{d}_{n+1}P_n + f_n(\beta) = \hat{d}_{n+1}(P_{n+1} - P_n) + f_n(\beta)\\ &= \hat{d}_{n+1}P_{n+1}(1 - 1 - \eta_n) + f_n(\beta) = -\eta_n\beta_{n+1} + f_n\\ &\Rightarrow \Delta\beta_n + \frac{C_{n+1}}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}\beta_{k+1} = \frac{1}{r_nv_nu_{n+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k(\mathcal{A}^kg(\beta))_n, \quad n \geq n_0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.55}$$

From (8.55) we immediately obtain

$$r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = -\frac{v_n}{u_n}\,\frac{u_{n+1}}{v_{n+1}}C_{n+1}\beta_{n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k(\mathcal{A}^k g(\beta))_n, \qquad n \ge n_0. \tag{8.56}$$

Then from (8.47), Assertion 1.1, (7.3), (7.5) and (2.2) we get

$$r_n v_n u_{n+1}|\Delta\beta_n| \le \frac{u_{n+1}v_n}{u_n v_{n+1}}|C_{n+1}|\;|\beta_{n+1}| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}|(\mathcal{A}^k g(\beta))_n| \le \tau A_n + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(2A_n)^k\tau \le \tau A_n,$$

$$A_n \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,$$

or, finally,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n v_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = 0. \tag{8.57}$$

Let us write down the system of equalities (8.56) in the vector form

$$\mu = g(\beta) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k\mathcal{A}^k(g(\beta)) = (E+\mathcal{A})^{-1}g(\beta). \tag{8.58}$$

In (8.58), E is the identity operator, $\mu = \{\mu_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$, $\mu_n = r_n u_n v_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n$, $n \ge n_0$, $g(\beta)$ and the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is defined according to (7.3) and (7.2). From (8.58) it follows that

$$\mu = g(\beta) - \mathcal{A}\mu. \tag{8.59}$$

Equality (8.59) written in the coordinate form looks as follows:

$$\mu_n = -\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n}\,\frac{v_n}{v_{n+1}}C_{n+1}\beta_{n+1} - \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\frac{C_{k+1}\mu_k}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}}, \quad n \ge 0. \tag{8.60}$$

Let us plug the values μ_n, $n \ge n_0$ and C_n, $n \ge n_0$ (see (1.8)) into (8.60). We obtain (6.2):

$$r_n u_n u_{n+1}\Delta\beta_n = -\beta_{n+1}\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\sigma_k u_k^2 - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty}\Delta\beta_k\sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty}\sigma_m u_m^2, \qquad n \ge n_0.$$

Thus, under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 there exists a solution of problem (6.2)–(6.3), and therefore problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable (see Lemma 6.2). Since the series G converges by assumption, from Theorem 1.4 it follows that the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is also solvable. ☐

Proof of Corollary 1.3.1. I) Suppose that the series J (see (1.7)) converges (at least, conditionally). From (1.15) and (1.9) it follows that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{|\operatorname{Re}(J_{n+1}\overline{C}_{n+1})|}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{|J_{n+1}|\;|C_{n+1}|}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{A_{n+1}|C_{n+1}|}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}}.$$

Therefore, if any of the first two inequalities of (1.18) holds, the series L (see (1.15)) absolutely converges, and by Theorem 1.3 problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable. Furthermore, if the third series in (1.18) converges, by Lemma 5.2 the series G also converges, and problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable in view of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This statement immediately follows from the proven part I) of Corollary 3.1.1. Here assumption (1.11) is not used and is superfluous.

II) If the series J (see (1.7)) and P (see (1.16)) converge (at least, conditionally), by Lemma 1.1 the seres G (see (1.14)) also converges, and then by Theorem 1.3 problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable.

III) If the series J (see (1.7)) and the series (1.19) converge, then the series P absolutely converges, and problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable by part II) of this corollary.

IV) If the series J absolutely converges, inequality (1.19) holds, and problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable by part III) of this corollary. $\square$

9. Examples

In this section we present three examples illustrating the power of Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 and the simplest tools for their application. For the reader's convenience and for brevity we analyze all the examples according to a common scheme consisting of steps I-IV.

I. Study of the FSS $\{u_n, v_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ of the basic equation (1.2).

In the examples below, the FSS of equation (1.2) can be easily found in an explicit form. To apply Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 in these examples, it is enough to have sharp by order estimates of the FSS. Here such estimates can be obtained by standard methods without any difficulties, using the classic Cauchy-Maclaurain Theorem [5, vol. II, §2.373], and therefore we do not prove them.

II. Study of necessary conditions for the solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.6).

In this step such conditions are obtained with the help of Theorem 1.2. More precisely, we find conditions for the convergence of the series σ (see (1.12)), present a priori sharp by order estimates of the terms of the sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$ (see (1.8)), and, as a corollary, precise conditions guaranteeing equality (1.13).

III. Study of the condition for the coincidence of problems (1.4)–(1.6) and (1.4)–(1.$*$).

In this step, following Theorem 1.4, we establish precise conditions for the convergence of the series G (see (1.14)).

IV. Study of conditions for the solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$).

In this step, following Theorem 1.3, we find precise conditions for the convergence of the series J (see (1.7)); conditions for the convergence of the series G are given in step III.

Note that taking into account the above description, below we give no further comments on the problems arising at each step. The results obtained in each step of the above program and the corresponding conclusions are given in the course of the exposition. Finally, throughout the sequel the notation $\varphi_n \asymp \psi_n$, $n \geq n_0$ means that the following inequalities hold:

$$\tau^{-1}|\varphi_n| \leq |\psi_n| \leq \tau|\varphi_n|, \qquad n \geq n_0.$$

In the following example, we describe the situation where problem (1.4)–(1.6) and (1.4)–(1.$*$) do not coincide, and therefore the analysis of the Hartman-Wintner problem based on our theorems contains inevitable gaps.

Example 9.1. Consider problem (1.4)–(1.6) for the equations

$$\Delta(e^{-n}\Delta y_n) = (n+1)^\gamma e^{-(n+1)} y_{n+1}, \qquad n \geq 0 \tag{9.1}$$

$$\Delta(e^{-n}\Delta z_n) = 0 \cdot z_{n+1}, \qquad n \geq 0. \tag{9.2}$$

In connection with Example 9.1, we have the following result.

Assertion 9.1. *For equations* (9.1)–(9.2), *problem* (1.4)–(1.6)

1) is not solvable for $\gamma \geq 0$ *and* $\gamma \in \left[-1, -\frac{1}{2}\right)$;

2) is solvable for $\gamma \in (-\infty, -1)$.

Remark 9.1. For $\gamma \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}\,, 0\right)$, problem (1.4)–(1.6) is not equivalent to problem (1.4)–(1.$*$), and therefore the problem on solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.6) remains open in this case.

Proof of Assertion 9.1. I. The sequence $u_n \equiv 1$, $n \geq 0$, is a principal solution of (9.2) (see (1.3)). By formula (3.7), we find a non-principal solution $\{v_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of equation (9.2):

$$v_{n+1} = u_{n+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} e^k \asymp e^{n+1}, \qquad n \geq 0.$$

II. The series σ is of the form (see (1.12)):

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sigma_n u_n^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^\gamma e^{-n}$$

and therefore converges for every $\gamma \in R$. Consider C_n, $n \geq 1$ (see (1.8))

$$C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n}\sum_{k=n}^{\infty}\sigma_n u_n^2 \asymp e^n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} k^\gamma e^{-k} \asymp n^\gamma \tag{9.3}$$

Hence $C_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ if and only if $\gamma < 0$. This implies that for $\gamma \geq 0$ problem (1.4)–(1.6) is not solvable.

III. The study of the series G (see (1.14)) is based on the application of (9.3):

$$G=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_nu_nv_{n+1}}\asymp\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^{2\gamma}.$$

Hence the series G converge if and only if $2\gamma<-1$.

We conclude that for $\gamma\in\left[-\frac{1}{2},0\right)$ problems (1.4)–(1.6) and (1.4)–(1.$*$) are not equivalent, and for $\gamma\in\left(-\infty,-\frac{1}{2}\right)$ these problems coincide.

IV. By the results of Step I, we have (see (1.7)) $J=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sigma_nu_nv_n\asymp\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^{\gamma}$.

We conclude that for $\gamma\in\left[-1,\frac{1}{2}\right)$ problem (1.4)–(1.6) is not solvable (since the equivalent problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is not solvable), and for $\gamma<-1$ it is solvable (since the equivalent problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable. ☐

In the next example we consider a situation where problems (1.4)–(1.6) and (1.4)–(1.$*$) coincide provided at least one of them is solvable. Thus it turns out that problem (1.4)–(1.6) has been fully investigated because of the study of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$).

Example 9.2. Consider the problem (1.4)-(1.6) for the equations

$$\Delta(n^{\alpha}\Delta y_n)=\frac{1}{(n+1)^{\beta}}y_{n+1},\qquad n\ge 1 \tag{9.4}$$

$$\Delta(n^{\alpha}\Delta z_n)=0\cdot z_{n+1},\qquad n\ge 1. \tag{9.5}$$

Here $\alpha\ge 0,\ \beta\in R$.

In connection with Example 9.2, we have the following result.

Assertion 9.2. *Problem* (1.4)–(1.6) *for equations* (9.4)–(9.5) *is solvable if and only if*

$$\alpha+\beta>2. \tag{9.6}$$

Proof of Assertion 9.2. Throughout the sequel, each of the steps I–IV is subdivided into three substeps according to the value of $\alpha:\alpha\in[0,1)$, $\alpha=1$, $\alpha\in(1,\infty)$. Such a subdivision is necesary because the form of the FSS $\{u_n,v_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of equation (9.5) changes with changing the parameter $\alpha\in[0,\infty)$.

I.1) $\alpha\in[0,1)$.

The sequence $u_n\equiv 1$, $n\ge 0$ is the principal solution of (9.5). The non-principal solution $v_n,\ \ n=1,2,\dots$ is of the form

$$v_{n+1}=u_{n+1}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_ku_ku_{k+1}}=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{1}{k^{\alpha}}\asymp(n+1)^{1-\alpha}.$$

I.2) $\alpha=1$.

The sequence $u_n \equiv 1$, $n \ge 0$ is the principal solution of (9.5). The non-principal solution $v_n,\ \ n = 1, 2, \dots$ is of the form

$$v_{n+1} = u_{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \asymp \ln(n+1).$$

I.3) $\alpha > 1$.

The sequence $v_n \equiv 1$, $n \ge 0$ is the non-principal solution of (9.5), the principal solution $u_n,\ \ n \ge 1$ is of the form (see (2.1)):

$$u_n = v_n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r_k v_k v_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^\alpha} \asymp \frac{1}{n^{\alpha-1}}.$$

II.1) $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

In this case the series σ is of the form

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^\beta} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \beta > 1.$$

Consider the sequence C_n, $n \ge 1$. We get

$$C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_k^2 \asymp n^{1-\alpha} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^\beta} \asymp \frac{n^{1-\alpha}}{n^{\beta-1}} = n^{2-\alpha-\beta}.$$

Therefore $C_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2$. The collection of the given and the obtained necessary conditions $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta > 2$ is equivalent to the collection of conditions $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\alpha + \beta > 2$.

II.2) $\alpha = 1$.

In this case the series σ is of the form

$$\sigma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^\beta} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \beta > 1.$$

Consider the sequence C_n, $n \ge 1$. We get

$$C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2 \asymp \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^\beta} \asymp \frac{\ln n}{n^{\beta-1}} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad n \to 0,$$

since $\beta > 1$. Thus the collection of the given and obtained neccessary conditions $\alpha = 1$, $\beta > 1$ is equivalent to the collection of conditions $\alpha = 1,\ \ \alpha + \beta > 2$.

II.3) $\alpha > 1$.

In this case the series σ is of the form

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n^2 \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \frac{1}{n^{2\alpha-2}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \beta > 3 - 2\alpha.$$

Consider the sequence C_n, $n \geq 1$. We get

$$C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2 \asymp n^{\alpha-1} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{\beta}} \; \frac{1}{k^{2\alpha-2}} \asymp \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{n^{\beta+2\alpha-3}} \asymp n^{2-\alpha-\beta} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2$. Since for $\alpha > 1$ we have $\beta > 2 - \alpha > 3 - 2\alpha$, we finally get the collection of necessary conditions in this case: $\alpha > 1, \;\; \alpha + \beta > 2$.

We conclude that if problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable, then condition (9.6) must hold regardless of the value of $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$.

III.1) $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

In this case we get the series G in the form

$$G = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{4-2\alpha-2\beta}}{n^{\alpha} \cdot 1 \cdot n^{1-\alpha}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\alpha+2\beta-3}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2.$$

III.2) $\alpha = 1$.

In this case we get the series G in the form

$$G = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\ln n}{n^{\beta-1}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{n \ln n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln n}{n^{2\beta-1}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \beta > 1.$$

Here the conditions $\alpha = 1$, $\beta > 1$ are equivalent to the conditions $\alpha = 1$, $\alpha + \beta > 2$.

III.3) $\alpha > 1$.

In this case we get the series G in the form

$$G = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\beta+2\alpha-4}} \; \frac{1}{n^{\beta}} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{\alpha-1}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{3\alpha+3\beta-5}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2.$$

We conclude that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable if and only if problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable. Here condition (9.6) is a necessary condition for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.$*$).

IV.1) $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

In this case the series J is of the form

$$J = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n v_n \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{1-\alpha}}{n^{\beta}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\alpha+\beta-1}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2.$$

IV.2) $\alpha = 1$.

In this case the series J is of the form

$$J = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n v_n \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln n}{n^{\beta}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \beta > 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2.$$

IV.3) $\alpha > 1$.

In this case the series J is of the form

$$J = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n v_n \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{\alpha-1}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\alpha+\beta-1}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 2.$$

We conclude that the narrow Hartman-Wintner problem is solvable if and only if condition (9.6) holds. □

In the next example the perturbation $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is oscillating, and its absolute value $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ coincides with the perturbation from Example 9.2. Thus we show that the exact account of the oscillation of the perturbation allows one to significantly weaken requirements of solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.6).

Example 9.3. Consider the problem (1.4)–(1.6) for the equations

$$\Delta(n^\alpha \Delta y_n) = \frac{(-1)^n}{(n+1)^\beta} y_{n+1}, \qquad n \ge 1 \tag{9.7}$$

$$\Delta(n^\alpha \Delta z_n) = 0 \cdot z_{n+1}, \qquad n \ge 1. \tag{9.8}$$

Here $\alpha \in [0,1)$, $\beta \in R$.

In connection with Example 9.3 we have the following result.

Assertion 9.3. *The problem* (1.4)–(1.6) *for equations* (9.7)–(9.8) *is solvable if and only if*

$$\alpha + \beta > 1, \quad \beta > 0. \tag{9.9}$$

Proof of Assertion 9.3. Below in all the steps I–IV, we assume that $\alpha \in [0,1)$ even when it is not specially mentioned.

I. The sequence $u_n \equiv 1$, $n \ge 0$, is the principal solution of (9.8). The non-principal solution $v_n, \ n \ge 1$, is of the form

$$v_{n+1} = u_{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{r_k u_k u_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k^\alpha} \asymp (n+1)^{1-\alpha}. \tag{9.10}$$

II. In this case the series σ is of the form

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(k+1)^\beta}.$$

From the necessary condition for convergence of the series and Leibnitz's theorem, it follows that the series σ converges if and only if $\beta > 0$.

Consider the sequence $C_n, \ n \ge 1$. We get

$$C_n = \frac{v_n}{u_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sigma_k u_k^2 \asymp n^{1-\alpha} R_n(\beta), \qquad R_n(\beta) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(k+1)^\beta}.$$

Below we need the following lemma.

Lemma 9.1. *For any $\beta > 0$ there exists $n_0(\beta)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\beta)$, we have*

$$R_n(\beta) \asymp n^{-\beta}. \tag{9.11}$$

Proof. Let m be any even number. Then

$$(-1)^n R_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{(n+1)^\beta} - \frac{1}{(n+2)^\beta} + \cdots + \frac{1}{(n+m-1)^\beta} - \frac{1}{(n+m)^\beta} + (-1)^n R_{n+m}(\beta)$$

$$= \frac{1}{(n+1)^\beta}\left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+2}\right)^\beta\right] + \cdots + \frac{1}{(n+m-1)^\beta}\left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+m}\right)^\beta\right] + (-1)^n R_{n+m}(\beta).$$

By Taylor's formula, for any $\beta > 0$ there exists $n_0(\beta)$ such that for all $k \geq n_0(\beta)$, we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^\beta = 1 - \frac{\beta}{k} + O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \qquad k \geq n_0(\beta).$$

Here the constant $O(\cdot)$ is absolute and depends only on β. Let us now continue the calculation:

$$(-1)^n R_n(\beta) = \beta \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(n+k)^\beta (n+k+1)} + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(n+k)^\beta} \frac{1}{(n+k+1)^2}\right) + (-1)^n R_{n+m}(\beta).$$

All three summands in the last equality have finite limits as $m \to \infty$. Hence

$$(-1)^n R_n(\beta) = \beta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+k)^\beta (n+k+1)} + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+k)^\beta (n+k+1)^2}\right).$$

The obtained equality and Cauchy-Maclaurin's theorem imply (see [5, vol.2, §2.373]) imply (9.11) □

Thus for $n \geq n_0(\beta)$, we obtain for the value of C_n :

$$C_n \asymp n^{1-\alpha} R_n(\beta) \asymp n^{1-\alpha-\beta} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 1.$$

Thus if problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable, (9.9) holds.

III. In this case, for a given $\beta > 0$, for $n \geq n_0(\beta)$ (see Lemma 9.1) we get (see (7.15)):

$$G_{n_0}(\beta) = \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{|C_{n+1}|^2}{r_n u_n v_{n+1}} \asymp \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\alpha+2\beta-2}} \frac{1}{n^\alpha \cdot n^{1-\alpha}}$$

$$= \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\alpha+2\beta-1}} < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha + \beta > 1.$$

We conclude that problem (1.4)–(1.6) is solvable if and only if problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable, and condition (9.9) is necessary for solvability of problem (1.4)–(1.6).

IV. In this case, for a given $\beta > 0$ and the number $n_0(\beta)$ (see Lemma 9.1) we get (see (1.9), (9.10)):

$$J_{n_0}(\beta) = \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \sigma_n u_n v_n = \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(n+1)^\beta} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k^\alpha}.$$

Note that under condition (9.9) we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n(\beta) v_n = 0.$$

Indeed, from (9.10) and (9.11) it follows (for $n \geq n_0(\beta)$) that

$$R_n(\beta) v_n \asymp n^{1-\alpha-\beta} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad n\to\infty \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha+\beta > 1.$$

Let us now return to $J_{n_0(\beta)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n_0(\beta)} &= \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} (R_n(\beta) - R_{n+1}(\beta)) v_n = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} [R_n(\beta) v_n - R_{n+1}(\beta) v_{n+1} + R_{n+1}(\beta)(v_{n+1} - v_n)] \\ &= R_{n_0(\beta)} v_{n_0(\beta)} + \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{R_{n+1}(\beta)}{n^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

But from (9.9) and (9.11) it follows that the series in the right-hand side of (9.12) absolutely converges:

$$\sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{|R_{n+1}(\beta)|}{n^\alpha} \asymp \sum_{n=n_0(\beta)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\alpha+\beta}} < \infty.$$

We conclude that problem (1.4)–(1.$*$) is solvable if (9.9) holds. □

We can now prove the assertion stated in Section 1 (see Example 1.1). Let $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $1-\alpha < \beta \leq \frac{3}{2} - \alpha$. Then $\beta > 0$, $\alpha+\beta > 1$ and problem (1.4)–(1.6) for equations (9.7) and (9.8) is solvable. Let us verify that if, in addition, $\alpha + \beta \leq \frac{3}{2}$, then the series B (see (1.17)) diverges. Indeed, from (9.10) it follows that

$$B = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [|\sigma_n| u_n v_n]^2 \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{2-2\alpha}}{n^{2\beta}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\beta+2\alpha-2}} = \infty$$

for $2\alpha + 2\beta - 2 \leq 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha+\beta \leq \frac{3}{2}$, which was to be proved. □

REFERENCES

[1] Ravi P. Agarwal, *Difference Equations and Inequalities*, Dekker, New York, 2000.
[2] S. Chen, *Asymptotic integration of nonoscillatory second order differential equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **327** (2) (1991).
[3] N. Chernyavskaya and L. Shuster, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of a problem of Hartman and Wintner*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (11) (1997), 3213-3228.
[4] G.M. Fikhtengol'ts, *A Course in Mathematical Analysis*, vol. I, Moscow, Nauva, 1969 (Russian).
[5] G.M. Fikhtengol'ts, *A Course in Mathematical Analysis*, vol. II, Moscow, Nauva, 1969 (Russian).
[6] P. Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Wiley, New York, 1964.
[7] P. Hartman and A. Wintner, *On non-oscillatory linear equations*, Amer. J. Math. **75** (1953), 717-730.

[8] J. Šimša, *Asymptotic integration of a second order ordinary differential equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1) (1987), 96-100.

[9] C.C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of Functions*, Oxford University Press, 1939.

[10] W.F. Trench, *Linear perturbations of a non-oscillatory second order equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **97** (3) (2001), 423-428.

[11] W.F. Trench, *Linear perturbations of a non-oscillatory second order difference equation*, Jour. Math. Anal. Appl. **255** (2001), 627-635.